

P957
S471

JAMES H. GAILEY, JR.

United Theological

Library

MAR 18 1975

The Princeton Seminary Bulletin



Vol. XXXVI

AUGUST, 1942

Number 1

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

OFFICERS

ROBERT E. SPEER, D.D., LL.D., *President*
LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D., *Vice-President*
WILLIAM B. PUGH, D.D., LL.D., *Secretary*
CENTRAL HANOVER BANK AND TRUST COMPANY, New
York, N.Y., *Treasurer*

MEMBERS

Term to Expire May, 1943:

ALBERT J. MCCARTNEY, D.D. WASHINGTON, D.C.
JOHN H. GROSS, D.D. PHILADELPHIA, PA.
FRANK SERGEANT NILES PRINCETON, N.J.
RAYMOND C. WALKER, D.D. HARRISBURG, PA.
HAROLD E. NICELY, D.D. ROCHESTER, N.Y.
HUGH I. EVANS, D.D. DAYTON, OHIO
*JOHN M. T. FINNEY, M.D. BALTIMORE, MD.
EDWARD B. HODGE, M.D. PHILADELPHIA, PA.
WILLIAM MATHER LEWIS, LL.D. EASTON, PA.
JOHN H. SCHEIDE, Esq. TITUSVILLE, PA.
JOHN J. NEWBERRY, Esq. NEW YORK, N.Y.

Term to Expire May, 1944:

MINOT C. MORGAN, D.D. GREENWICH, CONN.
STUART NYE HUTCHISON, D.D. PITTSBURGH, PA.
WILLIAM B. PUGH, D.D., LL.D. PHILADELPHIA, PA.
J. AMBROSE DUNKEL, D.D. NAPOLEON, OHIO
WALTER L. WHALLON, D.D. NEWARK, N.J.
RALPH COOPER HUTCHISON, Ph.D., D.D. WASHINGTON, PA.
HENRY E. HIRD, Esq. RIDGEWOOD, N.J.
SPENCER S. MARSH, Esq. MADISON, N.J.
COL. GUILFORD C. BABCOCK MORRISTOWN, N.J.
WEIR C. KETLER, LL.D. GROVE CITY, PA.
RICHARD J. DEARBORN, Esq. SUMMIT, N.J.

Term to Expire May, 1945:

JOHN B. LAIRD, D.D. PHILADELPHIA, PA.
LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D. BRYN MAWR, PA.
PETER K. EMMONS, D.D. SCRANTON, PA.
WILLIAM HALLOCK JOHNSON, D.D. PRINCETON, N.J.
BENJAMIN F. FARBER, D.D. NEW YORK, N.Y.
W. OLIVER BRACKETT, Ph.D. LAKE FOREST, ILL.
ROBERT E. SPEER, D.D., LL.D. LAKEVILLE, CONN.
JOHN T. MANSON, Esq. NEW HAVEN, CONN.
KENNETH H. LANNING, Esq. TRENTON, N.J.
JUDGE ADRIAN LYON PERTH AMBOY, N.J.
RAY VANCE, Esq. MAPLEWOOD, N.J.

* Died May 30, 1942.

Published Quarterly by the Trustees of the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church.
Entered as second class matter, May 1, 1907, at the post office at Princeton, N.J., under the
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

The Princeton Seminary Bulletin

VOL. XXXVI PRINCETON, N.J., AUGUST, 1942

No. 1

THE PRINCETON INSTITUTE OF THEOLOGY

WE laid our plans for it with mingled hopes and fears. As to the need for such an Institute as we projected there could be no doubt. Neither was there any doubt in our minds that by mobilizing the resources of our Faculty and by inviting the collaboration of some carefully selected preachers and scholars from outside our Seminary family, we could present an unusually strong body of lecturers. But was this an opportune year to begin? We reasoned thus: If the need is real, the best time to begin an enterprise for God and His Church is always when circumstances are most difficult and the problems greatest. So we trusted God, made our plans, drafted the program, and carried the project through.

The response surpassed all our expectations. We had expected that about a hundred people might attend, and we would have felt that the Institute was worthwhile if that number came. The final registration was over one hundred and eighty, representing sixteen denominations and eighteen states, including the Dominion of Canada. The time spent together in the classrooms of Stuart Hall, at worship in Miller Chapel, in fellowship beneath the maples, in the dormitories, and at meals, was unforgettably rich. There came to us new insights into divine truth and human need, and fresh inspirations to gird ourselves for the service of our Lord. It was the feeling of everybody that something had been begun of great significance for the religious life and thought of the Church. Expressions of desire were heard on all hands that the Institute of Theology might become an annual event.

It was clear that we had acted wisely in deciding to have an *Institute* rather than a conference. The conference, in which those who register attend one meeting after another for instruction or inspiration, is no longer adequate to meet the present-day needs of ministers and Christian workers. The contemporary situation in the Church and in the world is so baffling that the presuppositions of thought and life need close scrutiny. Many who are engaged in the work of the Church are so confused and disheartened that something is needed which shall combine the intellectual atmosphere of the school with the inspirational features of the Christian workers' summer conference at its best. Some felt that the fare was too rich and that the variety of courses offered was unnecessarily great. On the other hand, some of these courses may be repeated at intervals in cycles of adequate duration. But

the task is clear. Those who serve the Christian Church in our time have a great variety of intellectual and spiritual needs, and these must be met. Our Institute was an attempt to meet them.

We announced an Institute of *Theology*. We did so with deliberation. It is part of our task in Princeton Seminary to rehabilitate the term theology, and not merely the term but the reality, in the modern religious life of America. The time has come again when life in its bewildering complexity and in all its diverse spheres must be thought of in terms of God and His self-revelation. At bottom every human problem is a theological problem, and this needs to be made clear both to the religious and lay mind in our time. We can emerge from our present confusion only when the Queen of the Sciences comes back to reign in human culture, flashing the light of Biblical truth upon the anarchic cultural scene and integrating knowledge into a unity through the light of Jesus Christ.

The incorporation of the name *Princeton* into the official title of our Institute was intended to infuse fresh contemporary meaning into a sacred tradition. We desire to take the Bible and Biblical religion with the same seriousness as did the "gentlemen of Princeton" of a hundred years ago. While not being mere traditionalists or idolizers of a static past, we relate ourselves to the Reformed tradition in theology of which Princeton was the finest expression in the Western world. As heirs of that heritage which is expressed theologically in an acceptance of God's self-revelation in Holy Scripture, religiously in a concern to produce new men in Christ, ecclesiastically in the Communion of Saints, and culturally in an effort to bring Christian truth to bear upon life and thought in all their aspects, we would face with courage and decision the problems of our era.

One of the factors that inspires us to go forward upon a wide front is a sense of comradeship with a group of Christian scholars on our sister campus. These distinguished laymen are eager to play their part with us in making a concentrated frontal attack on the present secular order in the name of Christ and our common Christian heritage. We trust that as the years go by and our Institute develops, the name Princeton will become associated in a dynamic way with an aggressive and constructive approach to the spiritual problems of our time. For this is clear. We have come to a moment in history when the Christian Church must mobilize as she has never done before the forces of her laity who are scattered among a thousand institutions of learning, if Christianity is to make a contribution commensurate with the needs of the present time.

Let us, therefore, begin to think in terms of the Princeton Institute of Theology for 1943. The tentative dates are July 5 to 15. Let us pray that plans for the Institute may be made under God's own guidance. And a year hence may this campus become the rendezvous of a still larger group of earnest spirits, met together to learn what Jesus Christ would have us say and do in such a time.

J.A.M.

MODERN PROBLEMS OF NEW TESTAMENT EXEGESIS¹

OTTO A. PIPER

Helen H. P. Manson Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis

MR. President, Dr. Mudge, Members of the Faculty, of the Board of Trustees and of the Student Body, Ladies and Gentlemen:

When on this most solemn occasion I attempt to analyze my sentiments I find that I feel very much like a shipwrecked sailor who at last has reached the shore. His boat has been smashed by the violence of the elements, he has spent many days in a rather precarious situation on the waves of the ocean, time and again being tossed up by the billows and submerged into the salty flood, his mouth and tongue still filled with the bitter waters of the infinite sea, his skin parched by storm and pitiless sunshine, his mind tired from incessantly looking over the unlimited vastness of the element. Thus he is hardly able to understand what has happened to him when finally his weary body touches solid ground again. But how great will be his joy, and how exuberant gratitude will he show to his creator when gradually he realizes that the fierce struggle has been brought to a lucky end, and that the divine Providence has preserved him for further tasks in this life. Similar are my feelings on this day. From a career in which most everything seemed to be settled definitely for the rest of my life history unpredictable vicissitudes and the arbitrary whims of men uprooted me completely. A gulf of nearly nine years separates me from the last semester I lectured to my students in Muenster-in-Westphalia. When I dismissed my class on that memorable last day of July in 1933 we were in the middle of the momentous church conflict, the consequences of which very few people were

capable and willing to face then. I saw the bitter determination which dominated the Nazi movement and their inflexible decision to carry their struggle for absolute power to the crushing of all rival forces. The only solace I had for those young men who were soon to be the officers of the Church's fighting army was the promise of our Lord that where two or three were gathered in His name He would be in their midst.

At that moment I did not anticipate, however, that soon Fate would separate me from my students, my family, my home church, and my native country. There followed times of uncertainty and fear, of loneliness and perplexity, of profound shame for what was done in the name of my country, and of deep apprehensiveness for the destinies of the countries which while offering me hospitality did not heed my warnings and wondered at what seemed to them unfounded pessimism on my part. But I cannot turn back to the memories of those past years without remembering with deepest thankfulness the grace of God who safely guided me through unknown regions, who provided shelter and food and friendship and work. Above all it was by His mercy that my exile became a period of invaluable spiritual experiences. Out of bitterness and anxiety and disappointment there grew a clearer understanding and a deeper appreciation of the love of our Lord Jesus Christ who visibly blessed me and my work in those days of darkness.

Now by the friendship and indefati-

¹ Inaugural address delivered in Miller Chapel on February 9, 1942.

gable efforts of Dr. Mackay and the confidence and sympathetic appreciation of the Board of Trustees a new task has definitely been entrusted to me. The shipwrecked exile is no longer the helpless victim of the faithless billows. You have brought him to the shore, and he is now to sail out again on the strong and solid vessel that you have provided for him. Next to God who so graciously and without any merits of mine has directed my destinies to this point, I wish at this solemn occasion to express my deepest appreciation to all those who have made possible my installation to the Helen H. P. Manson Chair of New Testament Literature and Exegesis in Princeton Theological Seminary. To me and my family you have given a new home and a new country of which we rightly can feel proud, and you have enabled me to continue the type of work which is dearest to my heart and by which I hope to be able best to serve the Church of God.

It is not as a complete stranger that I come to this chair. For nearly five years now I have enjoyed the great and enviable privilege of teaching in this school whose fame has spread over the whole globe. Ever since in 1937 President Mackay brought me over from England I had ample opportunity to notice how great a distinction I had received when I was called to teach in this institution. If I had not yet known it previously, experience would have taught me daily what beneficial effects Princeton Theological Seminary has had upon the church out of whose midst it grew up, as well as upon the entire mission field and all the other Protestant churches. By teaching first Systematic Theology and then New Testament at Princeton I became acquainted with its spirit of unfailing allegiance to the Biblical truth and to the principles of the Reformation for which this institution has always made such a firm and unambiguous stand. At the same time I was deeply impressed

by the high standards of theological scholarship that students and professors alike had set to themselves in the pursuit of their studies, and the great zeal with which they applied them to their work. It was a source of special joy to me to work under the leadership of an exceptionally gifted president who is not satisfied with simply preserving the traditions and the heritage of a grand past, but who, guided by the vision of a Church of Christ in a changing world, thinks of new ways and fields of teaching and education. His aim is to enable our students best to adjust their ministry to the new demands that perplexed contemporaries, an ailing society and a war-torn world are making upon them. It gave me great satisfaction to notice how this far-looking policy obtained the full-hearted and unreserved support of a body of wise and devoted trustees and was sympathetically endorsed by the large family of faithful alumni. This program and this leadership in turn helped to promote a most pleasant atmosphere of friendship, sympathetic mutual understanding and collaboration among all the members of our large faculty. Last but not least of my experiences here let me mention the fervent and yet humble spirit of simple and sincere piety and faith that pervades both studies and personal life here on the campus. We know of no cleavage between class-room and chapel. Everything here in this seminary serves the supreme end of upbuilding Christ's church. Our teaching is scholarly, but never merely for knowledge's sake; it is intended to lead to an increasingly deepened understanding of the Gospel and of our task as ministers of the Gospel. The chapel services that are conducted by our senior students reveal in turn the influence of the class-room by their thoughtfulness, the width and breadth of their outlook, and by their diversity.

In many instances his inauguration places upon the new incumbent of a chair

the rather sad duty of giving a memorial address in honor of his deceased predecessor. There are no pathetic memories that fill our minds in this hour. It was my special privilege to work in the New Testament field under the splendid leadership of my predecessor, Professor William Park Armstrong, D.D. In long years of a richly blessed ministry he has built up the frame and the traditions of New Testament studies here in the Seminary, which I am now to continue. The high level of his scholarship, his fearless recognition of critical problems in the presence of obscurantism and dead traditionalism, the clarity of his judgment, the rich spirituality of his outlook, his profound knowledge of the human heart and his undaunted presentation of the truth of the Gospel in an age that hates commitment and definiteness, have made him one of the outstanding figures in the history of this Seminary and of the Church. It was therefore with special joy and satisfaction that his colleagues and students learned of his decision to carry on his work as Graduate Professor of New Testament Exegesis, when his health made it imperative for Dr. Armstrong to give up the heavy physical burden connected with his work in the undergraduate section of the Seminary. Already this intensification of his work and this concentration of his efforts begin to show their fruits in the fine quality of graduate work in the Biblical Department. Dr. Armstrong's study at 74 Mercer Street, where he meets with his graduate students in an informal way has become a sanctuary of learning and one of the foci of intellectual life on the campus. I know I speak not merely on my own behalf but also express the feelings of all my colleagues and our students when I say how highly we feel honored and how glad we are to have Dr. Armstrong yet working among us and with us. It is our hope that the years which are left to him until the pitiless law of age-limit sets a

goal to his official activities here in the Seminary will see the unhampered continuation of his invaluable services, and I for one do wish and desire that when once he enjoys his *otium cum dignitate* his advice and friendship will be preserved to us for many a year to come.

The Present Situation in New Testament Exegesis

This day and this installation ceremony seem to offer a fitting opportunity for discussing some of the problems that confront a New Testament scholar in a position like mine. Anybody who, from the viewpoint of conservative Protestantism, surveys the field of New Testament studies in this country cannot fail to be struck by the critical condition in which he finds things at the present time. Firstly, there is the almost complete absence of conservative exegetical scholarship. Apart from an unscholarly literalism practiced by small but vociferous groups, the whole camp seems to have surrendered to the prevailing positivistic spirit of the age. With apologetic recommendations of the Bible it practically beats the retreat everywhere. Much work is being done in the fields of historical research and literary analysis, but in the majority of cases it implies the denial of the authority of the Bible and thus remains of necessity fragmentary in character. Moreover, there is in this country the almost complete neglect of philological studies in the New Testament field. While we have some competent scholars in textual criticism and the study of the Koinē, there is nothing on this side of the Atlantic that could compare with the work of British and Continental theologians in the field of Biblical philology, lexicography and semantics.

Finally, there is the disregard for objective standards of exegesis. The average exegete follows his fancies and inclinations, and the minister who takes the trouble of consulting more than one commentary

feels equally free to pick out the opinions that agree best with his own views. It is with this latter evil that I am especially concerned at the present moment. If conditions are to be improved at all we have to rediscover the basic principles of exegesis and to define them afresh.

Exegesis is a technique rather than a science in the sense in which the ancients distinguished between *τέχνη* and *σοφία*. It is practised on the basis of the work done by one's predecessors and constantly checked by contributions of those who work on the same problems at one time. In exegesis, we do not, as a rule, start from certain general principles which we apply to our studies. Yet each technique has its underlying theory however unaware the exegete may be of it. Plato pointed out long ago that the *ἐρχηνευτικὴ τέχνη*, the ability rightly to apprehend the meaning of a document, must be supplemented by *σοφία*, i.e. the faculty of discovering the place of its content within the system of truth and values. It can hardly be denied that as far as Biblical exegesis is concerned, its theory, the so-called hermeneutics, has been treated as a step-child by the theologians of the last generations. Since Terry's *Biblical Hermeneutics* (N.Y. 1885) no satisfactory theological treatment of this subject is extant. George H. Gilbert's *Interpretation of the Bible; a short history* (Macmillan 1908), very valuable as far as it goes, is, as the sub-title indicates, a purely historical approach to the subject; and Harvey E. Dana's *Searching the Scriptures; a handbook of NT hermeneutics* (New Orleans Bible Institute Press 1935), while transcending the merely historical treatment nevertheless does not attain to clear theological principles.

It can be said without exaggeration that the main reason for the present disappointing state of New Testament exegesis in this country is not so much lack of interest or of capacity to do the work, but

rather confusion concerning the basic axioms of Hermeneutics. While these axioms are the same throughout the ages, changing conditions inside and outside the church make it imperative to reconsider them from time to time and to define their actual meaning and scope.

Axioms of Hermeneutics

There are four hermeneutical axioms that are of special importance:

(1) Concerning the clarity of the Bible: The words of the Bible mean what they say.

(2) Concerning the authority of the Bible: the Bible is the Word of God.

(3) Concerning the purpose of Biblical revelation: The grace of God in Jesus Christ is the center of the Bible.

(4) Concerning the intelligibility of the Bible: The Holy Spirit is the organ of its true interpretation.

These axioms sound very simple and plausible when they are enunciated in this way. But when they are applied to the exegesis of the Bible in the present historical situation they are seen to imply a number of thorny problems. Let us examine them one by one.

Concerning the Clarity of the Bible

First Axiom: The words of the Bible mean what they say. This axiom demands respect for the literal sense of the Biblical text. We cannot understand the Bible unless we are convinced of the sincerity of its writers. Nor is the Bible a secret document with a cryptic sense which is disguised by the actual words of the text. Yet such absurd views must be held by many modern exegetes who find it necessary to "spiritualize" the text. Thereby they derive from the text information entirely different from what its words would normally predicate. We read *δαίμων*, the exegete translates: epilepsy; the text says "heaven," the theologian interprets: the heart of man; the Gospel says Jesus was

raised from the dead, the interpreter pretends these words mean he had an immortal soul; and so on. The modern exegete differentiates between what he calls kernel and husk, or symbol and reality in the Biblical texts. It is not just orthodox stubbornness when we energetically oppose arbitrary and negligent as well as deliberate disregard of the text of the Bible. To men who walk in darkness and despair the great problem of objective truth is concealed when we do not teach them the importance of the literal sense of Holy Scripture. If a scholar disagrees with the views expressed in the document under study it is his legitimate right to say so. But it contradicts all rules of sound scholarship when the impression is given that the document agrees with the scholar's views where it does not.

From about 1890 to 1914 there has been a marked return to the literal sense of the New Testament. The great leading scholars of that era, such as Harnack, Sanday, Holtzmann, Joh. Weiss, Bousset, Burkitt, and others attempted with an almost fanatical zeal to place the New Testament ideas into their original setting. These men gave us a new understanding of New Testament eschatology, of the central rôle belief in angels, demons, supernatural forces and supernatural events played in the religion of primitive Christianity, of the Jewish elements in the New Testament ideas of God, Messiah, Heaven, Spirit, etc. They also enabled us to take the peculiar outlook and approach of each of the Biblical writers more seriously than had been done previously. Conservative exegesis had long been of an harmonistic type that was more interested in the unity of the Bible than in the individual outlook of the writers. But realizing the peculiarities of the Biblical books is not merely a methodological requirement, it is also a great help for the appreciation of the Biblical message. For it is only when we notice the individual features that the full wealth

of Biblical revelation is made available to us. It is true to say that the above mentioned school not infrequently used its discoveries as a pretext to get rid of the historical gospels and to substitute a philosophy and theology of their own in its place. But their work is now continued on a sounder basis by a large group of scholars who collaborated in the momentous work of Gerh. Kittel's *Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Future historians will find that this work, with its ingenious combination of philological, historical and theological research, marks a new epoch in New Testament scholarship. It is much to be hoped that by a corporate effort of American scholars an English translation of this work will be effected. It would give a new and remarkable uplift to the study of the New Testament in this country.

Concerning the Authority of the Bible

Second Axiom: The Bible is the Word of God. I do not intend to take part in the controversy raging for some time now about the subtle distinction between the Word of God in the Bible and the Bible as the Word of God. Before this problem ever can be settled it is essential that the qualitative difference between the Word of God and the words of men should be recognized.

The authority of the Bible is not exclusively based upon the belief in its divine origin, but also and above all upon the fact that it is the *viva vox evangelii*, the living voice of God by means of which He conveys to us knowledge of His saving will. Thus the touchstone of true exegesis is to be found in the amazement and wonder the exegete experiences in studying the Bible. If the Bible simply confirms what you thought you knew already, if it does not change your outlook and constantly overthrow your favorite theories you may be quite certain that you have not yet apprehended its revelatory character.

As God's Word the Bible speaks of

mysteries which are unknown to men and angels and which cannot be brought to anybody's knowledge except by a divine unveiling. Everything in the Bible that can be known equally well from non-Biblical sources is most certainly not by itself a divine revelation, and thus we can also infer that by the very fact that something is found in the Bible it is meant to convey to us knowledge other than we would find outside the Bible. The many earthly things which are mentioned in the Bible are reported not for historical or scientific information, but for the purpose of raising our minds beyond all creatures right up to God Himself.

Luther's principle that "*Scriptura Sacra est sui ipsius interpres*" implies that the divine revelation given in the Bible is meant only to interpret its own subject, which is the saving purpose of God, nothing else. Or as the Westminster Confession puts it: "The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man's salvation, faith and life is . . . set down in Scripture." (Ch. I, Section VI.) This means that in the Bible the exegete must not seek information concerning matters that lay outside the purpose of the several writers. Thereby I understand not only secular matters, as for instance facts of history, science, or philosophy, that are not directly connected with God's saving purpose, but also information concerning spiritual matters which God deemed good not to reveal to man in this life. Many heated theological and ecclesiastical controversies were based upon the presumptuous dogmatism of theologians who held that they were able to know more than the Bible expressly stated.¹

On the other hand, if it be true that God reveals the divine mystery of His purpose of salvation in the Bible, He is certainly speaking of *supernatural realities*. Though His work deals with men and takes place here on earth, it is of the hidden supernatural relationship of man to God that

the Bible is speaking; and while God's work takes place in this world it is this world as encompassed and determined by a supernatural reality that forms the theater of God's saving activities.

These facts explain the *symbolic* character of Biblical language. Its words are the human words used in our common language. But they are filled with potentialities that they never possess in secular usage. This is true not only as far as anthropomorphisms in the description of divine attributes and actions are concerned, but also is the description of the heavenly world and of man's spiritual life couched in symbolic language. This statement does not do away with what we said a minute ago about the basic character of the literal sense of the text. It is the literal truth that God has properties which must be described as eyes and ears and arms; but it is also true to say that these terms were never meant to be interpreted in their "natural" sense. They are true and legitimate precisely because they are used symbolically. By symbol I do not mean a mere ideogram or an ideal that will never come true (Tillich), but rather a term that by analogy of an earthly thing designates a no less real supernatural reality. While most conservative exegetes instinctively refrain from literal exegesis when nature and actions of God are spoken of, much crude literalism is still rampant in the exegesis of other terms designating supernatural realities. This kind of literalism misses the truth of the text as much as does the

¹ We should rather refrain from adopting the principle expressed in the Leyden Synopsis, III, 18 that *quidquid ea (sc. Scriptura Sacra) continetur et cum ea vel expresse vel firma consequentia consentit verum dogma est*. See also the statement in the Westminster Confession, Chapter I, Section VI, that the whole counsel of God is either expressly set down in Scripture or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from it. This statement is acceptable only when it refers to a specific kind of "logic of revelation," which will enable the exegete to draw conclusions from the text *analogia fidei*. But purely rational syllogisms are not valid in this field.

spiritualization practised in the opposite camp. The reason why Protestant scholars so often have been hesitant in accepting such a symbolic view of Biblical revelation is twofold. Not only does its acceptance seem to limit the scope of spiritual knowledge, but the assumption of the symbolic character of Biblical language appears also to be detrimental to the Protestant doctrine of the *perspicuitas Scripturae Sacrae*. To these objections I would reply: would it be so bad if our first reaction to the revelation of the divine mysteries consisted in the confession that while they completely overwhelmed us yet they were too great, too strange, too sublime to be adequately apprehended by us? I for one must admit that I regard this as a necessary result of divine revelation. The more intensely I try to understand the meaning of the basic concepts of the Bible the greater is the perplexity which they cause in my mind. But we do not solve the problem by taking the sting out of them and assigning them a part in our natural, human systems of thought. They come from God, and they are meant to disturb our complacency and security.

But recognizing the mysterious character of Divine revelation does not mean that exegesis yields to complete irrationalism. Though our concepts of God and the spiritual world will remain inadequate as long as we live in this body, they are all related to certain quite definite aspects of the supernatural. Moreover, by the grace of God the language of His revelation is of extreme simplicity. A child can understand the words of the Bible. Whereas the value of philosophical and scientific language consists in its subtle differentiation, the value of Biblical language consists in its profundity. On account of the simplicity of Biblical language it is possible to reach agreement upon the essential truths among all those who are capable at all of understanding the spiritual nature of these

symbolic terms; and yet at the same time on account of their profundity ample room is left for diversity according to the nature and the degree of spiritual insight given to various interpreters.

Concerning the Purpose of Biblical Revelation

Third Axiom: God reveals Himself through the Bible in order to lead people to the recognition of His grace in Jesus Christ. The first two axioms can be accepted by Christian and Jewish students of the Bible alike. But for this very reason they are not by themselves sufficient to impart a specific character to the work of the Christian exegete. The third axiom satisfies an important requirement of interpretation. In our day belief in the absolute authority of the Bible seems to be untenable for two reasons: Firstly, while the understanding of a document depends on the intrinsic oneness of its subject matter and outlook there is no directly perceptible unity of subject matter to be found in the Bible; it deals with a very great number of disparate subjects. Secondly, it is held that the Bible can no longer be a living authority for us, because it bears too obviously the marks of its origin in a far-distant past, and in circumstances entirely different from ours.

Biblical scholars have attempted since early times to overcome the first of these obstacles. The most convenient solution seemed to be the assumption that there was a complete harmony between the human mind and the divine revelation. Thus it seemed to be possible by means of the organizing and unifying faculty of human reason to establish unity and system within the disparity of Biblical statements, and to discover the timeless truth in the historical garb. But quite apart from those many instances in the history of exegesis, where men who followed this method just read their own ideas into the Bible the method itself is inadequate. It is based on an erro-

neous view concerning the purpose of Biblical revelation. It assumes that the divine revelation as given through the Bible is primarily meant to teach men wisdom.

It was over against such mistaken views that the Reformers emphasized the revolutionary truth that when God revealed His mysteries to man's faith through the Bible, such revelation was the actual offer of His grace, not merely the record of His offer. This view implied both that there was a unified purpose underlying the whole of the Bible, and that the Bible had a single subject matter.

But during the last two centuries this view has been challenged to the same extent that modern methods of historical research were applied to the study of the Bible. The more such investigation is intensified the wider seems to grow the gap that separates modern man from the Bible and its times. To preserve the authority of the Bible in these adverse circumstances such brilliant scholars as Harnack, Weinell, Bousset and Schweitzer advocated that a distinction be drawn between elements of merely historical significance and the eternal values of the Bible. But the adoption of this principle was a delusion, not a solution. For there is no possibility of thus dissociating values from their embodiments and environment. Everything in the Bible is historical and in that respect contingent, yet the whole Bible has to be accepted as God's revelation. We may also add that the perplexity experienced by the students of the historical-critical schools subsists only as long as the nature and the purpose of Revelation are misunderstood.

The Bible is not merely a record of God's revelation in the past as implied in the famous phrase "*Deus dixit*," it is also and above all a divine act by means of which God directly offers salvation in Jesus Christ to every reader. That is what Luther had in mind when he spoke of the "*Deus loquens*" (i.e. the God who speaks), in Word and sacraments.¹ The only way

of adequately coping with the problem raised by historical criticism is the adoption of a dynamic, instead of the traditional static, conception of Holy Scripture.

First of all, viewed from this angle the Bible is important not primarily because of what it says about human ideas and historical events, but rather because of the fact that it is the record of God's dealings with mankind in Holy history. Thus the time distance that separates us from the days of Abraham and Jesus does not affect the value and the truth of the Bible because the purpose of God remains unchanged throughout the ages. The thoughts and actions of men that are recorded in the Bible are described therein not as being relevant in themselves, but rather as human responses and reactions to God's offer of grace.² Thus every passage in the Bible is truly understood only when its relation to God's saving purpose is apprehended. It is a methodological fault when exegesis is confined to an historical study of the ideas of the Bible, as is done in the majority of modern books on Biblical Theology, or when scholars think that the study of the types of religious experience represented in the Bible exhausts the task of interpretation. It is not surprising that with such methods the student of the Bible thinks he discovers discrepancies and incompatibilities existing between the various writers of the Biblical books. The fact that there exist great difference should not be denied. But deeper insight discerns the unity in the diversity. St. Paul, St. Peter and St. John, for instance, responded in different yet harmonious ways to Christ's Gospel. This is evidence of the fact that the Gospel, being God's word to man is of such a superior type of truth that its propagation can be

¹ See Otto Piper, *Gottes Wahrheit und die Wahrheit der Kirche*, 1933, pp. 9ff.

² In my view I Cor. 11:1-16 is not "evidence of rabbinical exegesis" in St. Paul's theology, but rather a masterpiece of theocentric interpretation.

carried out without the suppression of the peculiarities of its messengers.¹

Secondly, since the Bible is the voice of God Himself, the divine purpose expressed in it must not be interpreted in a merely historical way. But it is also insufficient to state that the Gospels are primarily religious, not historical documents. Important as such a distinction is it does not do full justice to the fact that the Gospels form a body of literature entirely different from both other Christian and Gentile religious literature. This is the peculiarity of the Bible that each of its words is spoken to us personally: it is the offer of salvation to us (*pro nobis*), and thus it is adequately apprehended only when the exegete recognizes the bearing a passage has upon his own life and predicament and of that of the group in which he is living.

Thirdly, since there is only one divine purpose throughout history the two Testaments must be considered as forming a unity. They are not identical in actual content,² but they are not two entirely independent volumes either. The New Testament presupposes the Old not merely historically. The Old Testament was the authority upon which everything in the life and faith of Jesus and his followers was based. Thus not a single passage in the New Testament can be rightly understood if its Old Testament foundations are ignored. The lack cannot be remedied by references to the religious life of the Intertestament period. Modern scholarship has done considerable work in the investigation of that period and thus has thrown much historical light on the New Testament. But it is also true to say that on the whole this new study has confused rather than elucidated exegetical problems. Most modern scholars are inclined to believe that the Intertestament period signifies a complete break with the pre-exilic and exilic religion of Judaism, whereas in fact both Wisdom Literature and the apocalyptic

works of that time rest upon, and are couched in, Old Testament faith and religious practice.

Fourthly, such Christocentric exegesis of the Bible makes it imperative for us to perceive each passage in the context of the whole Bible. The principle "*Scriptura Sacra est sui ipsius interpres*" precludes the use of isolated passages as proof-texts. We may refer to certain texts as to classical illustrations of a Biblical truth, but none of them has argumentative force in itself. The proof-text method was the outcome of the above criticized view that the Bible was primarily given for the purpose of teaching men wisdom.

For some twenty years now there has been a noticeable tendency in Protestant exegesis toward the recognition of the above stated axiom. This change in exegetical method is best illustrated by some recent works dealing with the ideas of the Church³ and of the Kingdom of God.⁴ The result of such studies does no longer depend on the authenticity of single passages such as Matthew 16:18, for instance, or the adequate understanding of Luke 17:20f and Matthew 11:12. Rather is the subject interpreted in the light of the whole teaching and purpose of Jesus, and these in turn are placed into their Old Testament setting. While it can be rightly objected that the above mentioned books still overemphasize the historical aspect of the problem and do not pay sufficient attention to God's redemptive purpose in history, they are, nevertheless, promising signs of an incipient change.

¹ This view underlies the whole of J. J. van Oosterzee's *New Testament Theology*.

² Wilhelm Vischer's *Das Christuszeugnis des Alten Testaments* (Munich 1936), amounts practically to this view.

³ R. N. Flew, *Jesus and His Church*, 1938; E. F. Scott, *The Nature of the Early Church*, 1941.

⁴ C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, 1936; F. C. Grant, *The Gospel of the Kingdom*, 1940.

*Concerning the Intelligibility
of the Bible*

Fourth Axiom: The Holy Spirit is the organ of true understanding of the Bible. The doctrine of the Bible as elaborated by the Protestant schoolmen of the seventeenth century led to the postulate of the *perspicuitas* of the Holy Scriptures. It was taught that all the essentials of the Bible were evident to every reader and the few remaining obscurities could easily be solved *analogia fidei*. But this ideal was never reached nor even approximated. On the contrary Protestant theologians disagreed in their interpretation of Scripture not merely with their Roman Catholic opponents, but also among themselves. Thus the divine factor which held the primacy in the process of Biblical inspiration seemed to be powerless over against human initiative in the process of exegesis. But this disturbing result is not to be attributed to a weakness on the part of the Holy Spirit, but rather to the theologians' ineptitude or unwillingness to make use of the divinely offered assistance for the work of exegesis. Even as the Bible itself, so does true exegesis originate from the Holy Spirit. The inspired Word requires pneumatic exegesis.

The aim of exegesis is well defined by Heinrici¹ when he says that "The final goal of exegesis is reached, when the theologian understands the subject of his text in the same way as the addressee of the document, and when he has the same comprehensive view of its origin, its goal and the means used for attaining this goal as had its author." To reach this lofty goal three conditions must be fulfilled: adequate appreciation of the document's intrinsic value, contemporaneity with the writer, and use of congenial principles of interpretation.

It is obvious that the ideal basis for a genuine understanding of the Biblical documents would be a faith identical with that of the writers of the documents. For his-

torical reasons no such identity is possible. But as Reformed theology has continually pointed out, it is sufficient for this purpose to have a faith that proceeds from the same Spirit as was operative in the writers of the Biblical books. It is exegesis practised on the basis of such faith that we call "pneumatic exegesis."

It has been objected that such an exegesis would move in a circle. The exegete would thus merely find his own beliefs in the Bible. Would it not be more appropriate for the exegete to assume an attitude of complete objectivity and detachment, fully realizing the strangeness of the Biblical ideas? But in this objection two different things are confused, the subjectivity of the exegete, and the operation of the Holy Spirit upon his mind. The Holy Spirit does not call forth identical ideas in the Biblical writers and in the exegete. But he will enable the exegete to move on the same spiritual level and in the same spiritual sphere as did the writers of the Bible. It is in this way that the exegete attains to the only possible kind of genuine contemporaneity with his documents. Nobody can feel and think exactly like persons who lived in 1520 A.D., or in 30 A.D. But through the mediation of the Holy Spirit a person can, nevertheless, live in real communion with those whose faith he shares. While thus as an exegete the believer will notice the differences between his ideas and those of the Biblical documents his faith will enable him to attain to a sympathetic understanding of his text. Thus the study of his documents will render it possible for him to experience the same spiritual realities the writers had experienced. His way of experience may be at variance with theirs, as probably was the case with St. Paul on the one hand, and his greatest interpreters, St. Augustine and Luther, on the other. But this inevitable element of subjectivity

¹ Art. Hermeneutik, biblische, in Prot. Realenzykl., 3rd ed., vol. 7, p. 723.

will not prove to be an obstacle to the apprehension of the substance and the true meaning of the text.

When we insist on the necessity of pneumatic exegesis we do not mean thereby that the Biblical texts are above literary and historical criticism. The Bible offers ample opportunity for the scholar's critical faculties. But critical methods must develop their criteria and procedure out of the nature of the material with which they are concerned. My contention is that the historical-critical school as well as Form Criticism frequently fail when tested by this basic rule of scientific criticism, because the scholars lack spiritual understanding of the Bible. They treat their texts as though they were newspaper reports.

Pneumatic exegesis will have a somewhat disturbing effect on both the exegete and the church. Our theological views and systems have constantly to be revised in the light of new exegetical insights.¹ We have no right to hinder or proscribe exegetical progress merely for the reason that it is not in accordance with established theological views. The Holy Spirit is not a destructive principle. But as a life-giver He is certainly opposed to stagnation and complacency. Now the Holy Spirit is given to the whole Church as the Body of Christ, and He operates in the individual believer only inasmuch as the latter is a member of that mystical body. Applied to the task of exegesis this statement means that the subjective element in the individual exegete's work has to be checked by the spiritual insights of the Church as a whole. Practically that means that the exegete can expect to do satisfactory work only when he accepts the fact that he is conditioned by, and responsible for, the spiritual life of his church. This is not to be interpreted in the Roman Catholic sense as though the church could establish practical rules for the interpretation of the Bible which had strictly to be obeyed by

every theologian, or that the church could decide authoritatively what the right interpretation of a certain Biblical passage or book should be. But no exegete has made himself a Christian. His personal faith presupposes the teachings, the experience, the spiritual fellowship, and the example of his denomination. Thus while the doctrinal standards of our church can never be absolutely binding for our exegetical work, they are of greatest heuristic value for our interpretation of the Scripture. As a condensed expression of the spiritual insights of past generations, who have earnestly striven for the true understanding of the revealed truth they will keep the exegete from indulging in personal fancies and speculations about the text that would be devoid of a factual basis. But these standards do not themselves indicate the goal of exegesis, they only point to the direction in which the latter is to be sought. Thus far from hampering the work of the exegete as is presumed by so many modern scholars,² ecclesiastical dogmas should be of real help for a deepened understanding of the Bible. It needs hardly to be mentioned that this allegiance to the confessional standards of one's church practically requires constant interchange and cooperation between Systematic Theology and Exegesis. For it is the teaching of dogmatics that keeps alive the standards of faith in the life and consciousness of a church.

If subjectivism and arbitrariness is one danger menacing pneumatic exegesis, narrowness of outlook is another. Thus the exegete has constantly to confront his findings with the views of rival groups.

The operation of the Holy Spirit is not limited to our own denomination. His field is the whole Church of Christ here on earth, notwithstanding the errors and evil practices of the various branches. Thus

¹ See Westminster Confession, Chap. I, Section 7.

² See Friedrich Torn, *Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments*, 1930, p. 211.

when we disagree with scholars of other denominations there must be always the presumption in favor of their exegesis that they were led by the Holy Spirit and that our teaching has to be checked by theirs.

In this connection I am thinking particularly of two things, firstly the necessity for the Protestant scholar to study the works of Roman Catholic theologians, and secondly, the necessity for the modern scholar to acquaint himself with Patristic exegesis. This latter task has been almost completely neglected in recent times. Misled by the handy selections of Patristic exegesis that are contained in the *catenae* those modern scholars who took the trouble of consulting them at all usually made a piecemeal comparison. I hope the time is coming now when we shall study some of the great commentators of the Ancient Church in their whole work. These two fields of studies will not merely broaden the outlook of the modern exegete, they will also and above all help him to discover those instances in his work, where he thought he stood faithfully for the truth of the Gospel, while in fact he stubbornly attempted to defend his prejudices.

Let me say just one word in conclusion.

It is a relatively easy thing for a theologian to draw up a program for sound exegesis, but it is a long and rough way from the vision to its realization. No great thing can be done without a lofty vision; and as ministers of the Church of Christ we are certainly called upon to collaborate in a magnificent endeavour. Yet none of us who are teaching here in the Seminary will see his vision come completely true. We shall all die by the wayside. All we can do in our lifetime is this one thing: that coming out of a great tradition we hand the torch on.

Not much seems to be achieved thereby. Yet doing this for the succeeding generations is not a hopeless and futile thing. For we have the assurance that our life-work will not be lost. If we erect it on the solid ground which is Jesus Christ we shall be living stones in the temple He is building here on earth. Not every one of us can be a pillar or an ornamental frieze. But each stone is needed for the perfection of the whole building. Suffice it that on the day of His glorious coming the Lord will say to us: "Well done, good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord!"

THE FOUNDATIONS OF AMERICAN LIBERTY

H. W. PRENTIS, JR.

*President, Armstrong Cork Company, Lancaster, Pa.
Past President National Association of Manufacturers*

The honor and privilege of addressing you tonight convinces me that, despite the sweeping changes we are witnessing in the world these days, the law of compensation is still effective. Born to blue-stockinged Scotch Irish Presbyterian parents, I have listened willingly or unwillingly to full many a sermon by Presbyterian ministers in the past fifty odd years, but little did I dream that I should ever have such a chance as this to get even with them en masse!

This Hour of Crisis

Our nation has spoken in unmistakable terms in these recent fateful months. The die is cast. Regardless of consequences, we have decided to offer "our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor" on the altars of the liberty of mankind. Our first duty, of course, at this hour of crisis is to give full support to our government and its military forces. With everyone doing his part, our ability to win through to a decisive victory cannot be questioned. But in that connection, it is imperative that the ancient altar fires of freedom be rekindled in the hearts of all our people since men fight valiantly only for ideals which they understand and in which they believe. Physical armaments are never adequate in themselves alone. Intellectual and spiritual ramparts are equally essential. Therefore, to be fully armed to meet the present crisis, America must have a new understanding of, and an absorbing faith in, the foundations of her freedom.

In this connection a terrible indictment can be justly drawn against almost every American—particularly those of us who have received the full benefit of our superb

system of public and private education. We have all been so smug and complacent. We have assumed so carelessly that our liberties were sacrosanct. We have so flagrantly neglected the duties of citizenship in a republic. We have so completely forgotten that the maintenance of representative democracy requires an exceptionally high degree of intelligent understanding and active cooperation on the part of all its citizens. We have been so busy with our personal affairs—so absorbed in material things—that we have tried to live without a political philosophy, and that cannot be done successfully in this country or anywhere else in the world. If the average American business man, for example, knew as little about his product as he does about his governmental and economic system, he would soon be in bankruptcy.

We all recognize, of course, that to wage modern war successfully requires the temporary relinquishment of many of our cherished freedoms. The devil must be fought with fire. Hence it is doubly important that at a time like this every educated citizen should be on guard and alert lest, when the present emergency is over, we find ourselves with only the empty shell of the Republic we are now giving our lives and treasure to defend. History shows that liberty has been lost far more frequently by the complacency, indifference, and ignorance of the citizenry themselves than by executive fiat or military conquest. Daniel Webster said: "God grants liberty only to those who love it and will always guard and defend it."

* Address delivered at the Alumni Dinner, Princeton Theological Seminary, May 18, 1942.

Unfortunately freedom and physical luxury seem to be congenitally incompatible. They have never remained long in political wedlock, but are soon divorced in the court of dictatorship. The love of liberty, we must ever remember, was not born in an automobile, lullabied with radio, nourished with quick-frozen foods, raised in central-heated houses, clothed in synthetic fabrics, entertained by movies or educated in palatial structures of granite and marble! It was born in a dungeon—in the fetters of tyranny. The time-worn historical cycle has been: From fetters to faith; from faith to freedom; from freedom to folly; from folly to fear; then from fear back to fetters once more. We in twentieth-century America are now about midway in the process. Let it not be written of us that having eyes, we saw not, and having ears, we heard not, the plainly written warnings of the past! Engaged as we are in a desperate war, we need now as never before to match our great cause with a great faith in the roots of our liberty.

The Roots of Our Liberty

These roots are sunk deep in philosophic and religious soil. They go down to those far days in ancient Greece when men sought to discover the requirements for living a good life in a republic of free men, and to those brief years of Christ's ministry in Judea, proclaiming the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God. At the very base of the taproot we find Socrates and Aristotle. Then the life-giving sap of their basic thinking vitalizes successively the minds of Cicero and Lucian, St. Augustine, William of Ockham, John Wyclif, Erasmus, John Calvin, Montaigne, Thomas Hobbes, John Milton, John Locke, Adam Smith, most of the founders of our government here in the United States and, more recently, Emerson and William James.

The roots of the opposing philosophy

lie in a second group of thinkers whom we might term the romantic or oriental school. Based on ideas originally brought into Greece from Asia or Egypt, this group includes the Dionysian cult, the Neo-Platonists, Pelagius, Rousseau, Schopenhauer, Tolstoy, Hegel, Marx, Hitler, Stalin, and in modern America, with certain qualifications, men like John Dewey.

The distinction I am drawing here is not in respect to theological concepts, but solely in regard to the general emphasis placed by these thinkers on the individual man's freedom of will. The first group has always held in broad terms that there is a vital relation between freedom and reason, that an act is voluntary if the person concerned is not coerced by anybody and is old enough to understand the meaning of what he is doing. Freedom, in other words, is intelligent behavior. Thus emphasis is placed on understanding and on the development of reason and intelligence. And society has been organized on the basis of "a meeting of minds and of mutual respect." The other group of philosophers to whom I have referred have generally said that freedom is related to desire; that if there is nothing that balks or stops us in carrying our desires into action, then we are free.

St. Augustine and Calvin held—to use the words of Hodge's *Systematic Theology*—that the doctrine of free agency teaches that "man is a free and responsible agent because he is author of his own acts, and because he is determined to act by nothing out of himself, but by his own views, convictions, inclinations, feelings and dispositions. . . . The profoundest of modern authors admit that this is the true theory of liberty." And even Buckle, who was not a friend of Calvin, concedes that "the doctrines which in England are called Calvinistic have always been connected with a democratic spirit."

Three great historic movements combined to foster and develop liberty among

the English-speaking peoples: first, the nominalist philosophy of the fourteenth century; second, the British Reformation two hundred years before Luther; and third, the revival of classical learning in England in the sixteenth century.

Neither the time nor the occasion permits an extended discussion of these three momentous movements and it would be presumptuous for me to attempt to do so anyway before this audience. Suffice it to say that the English monk, William of Ockham, the founder of the Nominalistic school of philosophy, postulated the fundamental tenet of English and American liberalism—individualism—about the year 1325 when he taught at Oxford. Applying that concept to government, the English-speaking peoples have said ever since that the reality of the individual and his concrete experience in a real world must be respected. Here is where British thought stands out in stark contrast to the romanticism of German philosophy.

The British Reformation

John Wycliff placed translations of the New Testament in the hands of the common people all over England; set up "conventicles" in which the populace got together for prayer and worship; and taught that the sacraments of the Church meant nothing unless the individual who accepts them knows what he is doing and what they signify. As a result, our forefathers came to the shores of the American continent impregnated with the principles of personal moral responsibility, the right of private judgment, and the right of free assembly, which, together, filled them with a fervent passion and unshakable belief in the inward spirituality of the individual. They based their political philosophy and their economic system on the concept that there is something about the human spirit that is sacred; that there is a place in the human soul that no government and no man may justly enter, where reside those

inalienable rights that the Declaration of Independence later thundered so eloquently to the world.

With this principle as the foundation, let us see how our forefathers erected this tripartite structure—the tripod—on which our individual freedom rests today. First they maintained that if man did possess a sacred personality, he had the right to choose who should rule over him. On that thesis they reared the first supporting tower of our edifice of liberty—representative constitutional democracy. Again they argued that since man possessed a sacred personality, he had the right to think, speak, assemble, and worship, as he saw fit. On that concept they erected the second tower of the structure of liberty—civil and religious freedom. And finally they reasoned that any man endowed with a sacred personality had the right to possess for himself such portion of the God-given resources of the earth as he could win by honest toil and effort. Thus they asserted every individual's right to private property and economic activity of his own choice, and on that basic tenet they built the third supporting tower of their temple of liberty—free private enterprise. These three towers stand or fall together. Destroy any one of them, and the whole structure of freedom soon collapses.

This whole process was not accomplished haphazardly. It was not the result of chance or circumstance. On the contrary, it was the fruit of generations of thought and sweat and tears and blood. That tripod of freedom is our most precious heritage in America today. How rarely blessed we are as a people may be realized from the fact that of the approximately forty billion human beings who have lived on this earth since the birth of Christ, less than three per cent have ever enjoyed freedom that even approaches the liberty that we enjoy in the United States at this very hour. And all of it goes back to that spiritual principle of the sacredness of the

individual soul—a principle for which our Church has fought through the centuries.

To avoid misunderstanding, let me make crystal-clear that when I use the term, free private enterprise, I do not mean the old *laissez-faire* of Adam Smith. I mean free private enterprise with reasonable umpiring on the part of government to ensure fair play, and to prevent abuses that lead to oppression and monopoly. But we must keep in mind that there is a vast difference between umpiring, i.e. government regulation, and outright government control. For when government ceases to be an umpire and with the full force of its dominating authority, steps into the business game itself, many a private player concludes that his chances of winning are so greatly diminished that a seat on the side lines is preferable. So individual initiative disappears, and the wellsprings of economic progress dry up.

In contrast to the regard for the individual displayed by our forebears, modern radicals, regardless of whether they call themselves communists, socialists, fascists, nazis, or American new liberals, deny or tend to deny the reality and sacredness of the individual. John Dewey, for example, says in his *Human Nature and Conduct* that anybody who thinks that there is anything spiritual or inner or personal about the individual must believe that there is something incommunicable and exclusive about the individual. Anybody who talks about such things is merely repeating an old out-worn aristocratic prejudice, for one cannot be democratic, he asserts, and believe in the inner spiritual sanctity of human beings. This is a logical conclusion if we are prepared to concede Dewey's thesis that the individual, after all, is nothing more than a set of conditioned reflexes in a living organism organized by environmental influences. To be scrupulously fair, I want to add that Dr. Dewey in his most recent writings does not seem to be quite so sure of his earlier position regarding

the sacredness of the individual soul. The terrible fruits of collectivism in Russia, Italy and Germany are making many of our "advanced" thinkers of the New Liberal type stop, look, and listen. But the impress of Dr. Dewey's earlier teachings is evident today in the attitude of thousands of educated people toward social, economic, and governmental problems.

The Revival of Classical Learning

The third factor which I mentioned some moments ago as being responsible for the development of English liberalism was the revival of classical learning in England in the sixteenth century. To round out this point, we must now turn back to ancient Greece and Rome. The ancient Greeks appear to have developed a love of liberty very similar to that which has characterized the English-speaking peoples. In the fifth century B.C. they drove the Persians back across the Aegean Sea and for the first time felt free of the threat of foreign domination and able to develop their own peculiar civilization. Almost the first question they asked was: "How can we live a good life?"—meaning by that phrase how they could be most happy and free to attain a full measure of intellectual and spiritual maturity. This question led to another: "What is good?" And since these people could not fall back on tradition or custom or tribal religion for an answer, they were obliged to try to think the question through on their own initiative and make answer on the basis of personal judgment, pioneer thinking, and good taste. The fruit of their attack on fundamental questions, such as these, lies at the source of the liberal culture of western Europe and America.

In Plato's famous parable of the cave in the Seventh Book of *The Republic*, he drove home the point that the mental processes of a free mind and those of the herd are as far apart as the poles. Such thinking consists not merely in what men

believe, but how and why. The free man deals with his life in wholly different fashion from the man whose mind has not been set free. Such a man has, as Aristotle points out, mastered his passions; tempered his judgment; will either doubt or believe on the basis of evidence only; will neither seek nor shun danger; and in all his relationships exhibit temperance and poise. Such is the man, according to the ancient Greek philosophers, who has found freedom through the exercise of wisdom. Wherever this concept of the free man has held sway, human life has found dignity and freedom; force has been reduced to a minimum; mutual respect and common counsel have been substituted for coercion; and democracy has developed. Aristotle warns us, however, that democracy tends to evolve into revolution and tyranny. The demagogue eventually appears who excites the passions of the crowd and then lures the people with promises that an abundance of material things will be theirs, if only the existing order be overthrown. How this process Aristotle so accurately describes is repeating itself in this present day!

Marcus Cicero, who may be regarded as the last great liberal of antiquity, was a great disciple of Aristotle. As consul of the Republic of Rome he crushed the Catiline rebellion. Not long ago I read some of the harangues made to the populace by the leaders of this rebellion, as reported by Sallust. They sounded most familiar. In fact, in their denunciation of capitalists and their demand for the redistribution of wealth, they might have been delivered in Union Square yesterday. Huey Long with his "Every man a king" or Stuart Chase with his "Economy of Abundance" could scarcely have done a better job.

Although Cicero was voted the title of "Father of his Country," he was unable to save the republic from the proletarian party, directed by one of the shrewdest

politicians that has ever appeared in human history, Julius Caesar. His adage, "With money we will get men and with men we will get money," has its modern counterparts. Cicero was liquidated in a purge fomented by Mark Antony and, after that, no man's life or property was safe. Dictatorship succeeded dictatorship, destroying not only the constitution of the republic but eventually all sense of political responsibility among its citizens. Interest in the ordinary duties of citizenship vanished. More and more planned economy followed, which led to more and more economic confusion. The currency was inflated; there was great unemployment in all the principal cities; no less than twenty per cent of the population were on the public payroll; taxes were so high that the farmers were compelled to turn their lands over to the government. Collective farming was attempted but the government could not get people to work because the proletariat no longer had the desire or habit of labor. The people lost political interest. Few cared to hold office. They would not even fight to save themselves. Finally the border was opened and the barbarians were brought in to raise crops and man the defenses.

It was not until fifteen hundred years after Cicero, that a group of Italians in Florence were able to set up a new republic. There, in an academy on the hillside of Fiesole, men began again to think and discuss questions as did the free men of ancient Greece and Rome. Interest in Cicero was renewed; they read and re-read his inspiring words about liberty. From this center came a new group of scholars—men like Erasmus of Rotterdam—who brought this old but ever new source of intellectual inspiration to the peoples of northern Europe and thus laid the foundations for the Revival of Learning in the modern world. Erasmus, who came to Oxford University to teach, Thomas Moore, and John Milton carried the phi-

losophy of Socrates and Cicero to Great Britain. Cicero became the great exemplar of patrician virtue in the minds of the free thinking liberals of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in England and America.

It is a significant fact that practically all the prominent New England patriots were educated in the Boston Latin School in Boston; that the Virginia group, Washington, Randolph, Wythe, Henry, Marshall, Jefferson, and Madison, all came directly or indirectly under the influence of Dr. Small of Edinburgh University, who taught logic and literature at William and Mary College in Williamsburg for a decade or two preceding the Revolution. In these schools our forefathers became acquainted with Socrates and Aristotle and the great English political philosophers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Nowhere is Ciceronian influence more evident than in *The Federalist Papers* of Hamilton, Madison, and Jay. Jefferson states frankly that the Declaration of Independence contains no new ideas but rests on "the elementary books of public right, as Aristotle, Cicero, Locke, Sidney, etc." Our founding fathers had a political philosophy. They believed in it and knew how to defend it. As Dr. Everett Dean Martin says, "The retention of this philosophy of freedom is the issue on which the survival of our republic will be determined."

Rousseau and Calvin

The philosophy of Rousseau is the exact antithesis of that of Calvin. Calvin taught the sovereignty of God; Rousseau places man acting as a mass in the place of God. Calvin believed in the sinful state of man. Rousseau teaches the essential, natural goodness of man. As Dr. John H. Randall, Jr., states in his work, *The Making of the Modern Mind*: "It is Rousseau's theory, as developed by the French Revolution, that has furnished the basis of the modern collectivistic state." Rousseauism is evident

in the teaching of all advocates of collectivistic theories. Marx, Hitler, Stalin, Dewey, all by and large are his disciples. According to their philosophy, the government, which is the sovereign will of man acting as a mass, grants such powers of property and liberty to the people as it sees fit. In Ortega y Gasset's words: "The people are converted into fuel to feed the mere machine, which is the State." Contrariwise, according to the philosophy of the English-speaking peoples, citizens set up a democratic government and grant it only such powers, funds, and privileges, as citizens see fit. There is no freedom-saving compromise possible between these two ideas.

In America, many well-meaning people, who at heart deny the validity of the sacredness of the individual are convinced that the process of social evolution in this country is inevitably toward a compulsory, planned economy. They welcome the ideal of collectivism but do not want to go the whole distance on the road to Moscow or Berlin. Actually they are reactionaries at heart because, without realizing it, they are advocating policies that will eventually destroy representative democracy, free private enterprise, and civil and religious liberty—the triune foundation on which our freedom rests.

As a great industrial nation, we have long been accustomed to plan ahead; hence the phrase, national economic planning, has something about it that appeals to almost every one at first blush. Certainly we need all the mutual consultation and voluntary planning we can get from government, labor, capital, and management. However, compulsory national economic planning is quite a different thing. That sort of planning actually rests on a series of delusions. Our national economic planners, in fact, are the modern prototypes of the medicine men of our barbaric ancestors. They actually believe that modern science, if only placed at the behest of all-powerful

government, can make the springs of plenty flow for everyone with little work on anybody's part and without the sacrifice of political, intellectual, and spiritual freedom. Compulsory economic planners are convinced, moreover, that somewhere there actually exist individuals who have the capacity to plan the economic affairs of the whole nation so as to build a steadily higher standard of living. Actually no such supermen are available. The stagnation and loss of impetus under such a system, due to the dilution of personal responsibility and initiative, would be appalling. Furthermore, if government once starts to direct the economic affairs of our basic industries in times of peace, the process will inevitably have to be extended to every phase of our economic life. Our economic processes are so closely interrelated that ultimately government would have to tell each one of us what we could buy, when and where we could buy it, and at what price; what we could produce, how much we could produce; where we could work and for what wages. Under a system of compulsory planning, there would be no stopping short of the bitter end. As Stalin said in 1934: "Without getting rid of capitalism and abandoning the system of private ownership in the means of production, you cannot create planned economy."

In times of war we cannot avoid it, but in times of peace the road to compulsory planned economy is the road to state socialism. And once state socialism becomes a reality and free private enterprise disappears, what happens to representative democracy, and civil and religious liberty? Obviously if a group of men calling themselves government were planning ostensibly for the greatest good of the greatest number, they could not brook interference from any citizen, no matter how well intentioned that citizen might be. It requires a lengthy period, moreover, to bring any great economic program to fruition. Meanwhile, the economic planners, that is, the

government, would have to mold public opinion so as to keep itself in power. Consequently, government would ultimately be compelled to control every opinion-forming agency—the radio, the press, the movies, the school, and the Church—at least insofar as anything advocated was at variance with the set plans of the state. In Germany, Russia, and Italy we witnessed the bitter fruits of compulsory economic planning in the fateful years before the war. It is your responsibility and mine to see that when peace comes, we avoid its pitfalls here in America. Free private enterprise—with reasonable umpiring by government to ensure fair play—representative democracy, and civil and religious liberty, I repeat, are the three inseparable supports of personal freedom. They stand or fall together.

What Shall We Do?

Now the question arises, what are we as preachers and ordinary citizens going to do about this whole problem? First as to business men: any fair-minded man will admit that free private enterprise has its faults—and many of them. What human institution does not? Representative democracy, organized religion, free private enterprise—nothing that relies on frail human beings can rise to any higher ethical level than the individuals who compose those institutions. In years gone by, there was a sad lack of personal responsibility, and ethical standards of conduct on the part of many leaders in business, banking, and commerce. But substantial progress has been made, I am convinced, through enlightened leadership—leadership that recognizes that the keystone of our freedom is the voluntary acceptance of the obligations of social stewardship.

If our republic is to be preserved, business men must recognize their historic mission as preservers of the precious values of human liberty. To that end they should be shining examples of civic virtue,

using that phrase in its classic sense. They must eliminate unethical practices in their own enterprises so that business can always come into the court of public opinion with clean hands; they must constantly endeavor to create better conditions of employment by the elimination of health and accident hazards; they must steadily seek ways and means of regularizing employment and cushioning the effect of advancing technology on the lives and fortunes of their workers; they must raise the standard of living by passing along the benefits of improved technique and quantity production through lower prices and higher wages; they must be keenly conscious of the social significance of their day by day decisions; they must be good stewards of the responsibilities with which individual freedom has entrusted them; they must be industrial statesmen rather than mere business men.

Second, as to education: I am not disposed to blame our schools and colleges for failure to inculcate the philosophic principles on which our government was established in the minds of the present and, shall I say, the past two generations of American citizens. After all, the degree of leadership that education can provide in a republic is determined by the current temper of the people. We Americans have been so engrossed for the past hundred years in our material affairs that we have simply not been interested in government. Hence it is no wonder that the study of religion, political philosophy, and classical history has gone into the discard. We must recognize, however, that facts never influence the mass mind as do ideas. With all our emphasis on materialism, education has been compelled to follow the crowd and teach concrete things rather than emphasize the abstract theories and principles which underlie and, in the long run, determine the facts of human existence. Has not the time come, however, when our schools and colleges would find intelligent

backing in stressing the value of a good old-fashioned liberal arts education? If our republic is to survive, we must instill in the minds of our citizens not only knowledge of our political institutions, their history and their way of working, but also faith and pride in what these institutions stand for; whence they came and with how much travail of body and spirit they were created.

Now as to the Church: no institution has more at stake in the conflict between individualism and collectivism than organized religion. As Walter Lippmann so truthfully says in his book *The Good Society*:

The real reason for the irreligion of Fascists and Communists is that religion cultivates a respect for men as men. Against that respect, the totalitarian state cannot long prevail. . . . The dictators . . . are not stupid men. They have seen truly that the religious experience must forever raise up new enemies of the totalitarian state.

The political philosophy of the English-speaking peoples, as we have seen, is based on religious faith, on the sacredness of the individual human soul. In that respect representative democracy certainly comes closer to the Christian ideal than any other form of government that the race has yet devised. It is indeed a tragedy, therefore, to find our fundamental political philosophy unwittingly attacked and undermined by good Christian men and women, who, in their keen anxiety and praiseworthy zeal to help the unfortunate improve their economic status, fail to realize that the remedies they seek through expanding government control, will eventually destroy American democracy and religious liberty itself. Christ said: "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I come not to send peace, but a sword." And I have thought frequently in these recent years that perhaps the explanation of that statement of His is to be found in the fact that our society today is permeated with Christ's admonition to bring food and

raiment and shelter to the needy without having at the same time enough individual unselfishness to make the attainment of that ideal possible without coercion. This same thought seems at the root of a striking passage that I ran across a few months ago in a biography of John Knox by Lord Eustace Percy:

We are witnessing the results of a society saturated with the Church's aspirations but unsteadied by its faith. . . . There is no nobler instinct than that which revolts against a civilization calling itself Christian but denying Christ in all its acts. None nobler, but none more dangerous, for it does not pause to ask . . . how far law can be the agent of life. . . . Of all the teachings of history the clearest is this: that those who seek to realize ideal aims by force of law are always unscrupulous and always cruel.

So Christian humanitarians find themselves impaled on a soul-disturbing dilemma. Shall we try to bring the abundant life (and when people use that term nowadays, they are usually thinking of material things, not things of the spirit) by coercion, by asking government to drive into line those who will not do their part, and in so doing run the risk of destroying representative democracy and ultimately freedom itself? Or shall we rely on the process of Christian education to raise our individual citizens gradually to a spiritual plane where they will recognize their social responsibility and voluntarily cooperate in raising the economic status of the unfortunate in our midst? Physical abundance never wet-nursed any people into freedom. It is spiritual and intellectual and economic freedom with its release of individual initiative that produces physical abundance.

As Christian ministers and laymen we must recognize that under representative democracy the human race has made substantial progress in its attitude toward women, children, the sick, the insane, the aged, and all those who have to toil on the weary highway of life, and hence we should think well and carefully before advocating coercive shortcuts to social jus-

tice that history shows will inevitably bring down the temple of self-government on the Church's own head. The true glory of any nation arises not from the compulsion of laws but from the spirit that activates the hearts and souls of its citizens. The solution of our social ills lies in the embodiment in our daily lives of those eternal principles for which the Church has fought through the centuries—the ethical concepts of the Sermon on the Mount, the Parable of the Good Samaritan, and the precepts of the Golden Rule. The glory of Christianity is that it exalts the individual. It encourages men to know the truth. Knowing the truth makes men free. "Democracy," as Dr. Mackay says in his recent book, "is a child of Christianity."

We live today in the shadow of war. We live to see helpless civilian populations blotted out as death rains from the sky. We live to see the sanctity of treaties and contracts violated at the caprice of wilful men. We live to see the culture and art of nations degraded by the sort of tyranny and cruelty that characterized the Dark Ages. We live to see old symbols of honesty, sincerity, and character mutilated under the heel of brutal military power. In the midst of such chaos, when moral and intellectual ideals are obscured and stained with crass selfishness and overweening ambition; when bewildered peoples eagerly grasp at the tenuous straws of alleged economic security offered by strongly centralized governments; when, as Emerson said, "Things sit in the saddle and ride men," America must turn again to the foundations of her freedom for national salvation.

"Faith of our fathers, faith and prayer

Have kept our country brave and free,
And through the truth that comes from
God,

Her children have true liberty:
Faith of our fathers, holy faith,

We will be true to thee till death."

CHURCH AND STATE IN THE LIGHT OF THE REFORMED FAITH*

FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER

I DEEPLY appreciate the honor and privilege of having a place on your program. The subject assigned me seems rather too spacious for the time at my disposal, but it certainly is a most timely one. It brings us face to face with some of the most important aspects of what has again become our fundamental social problem—the preservation of our freedoms.

Confessedly, the world we are living in today is not only sadly disillusioned but also utterly bewildered. In whatever direction we may look, we find men baffled by their difficulties and their distresses; nations in sheer fright of one another taking counsel of despair and forging arms and armaments as never before; states changing their governments with kaleidoscopic swiftness; and society, if not everywhere, yet in shockingly many instances, casting aside its time-honored conventions, its cultural standards of many generations, its priceless spiritual heritage, in favor of an unabashed paganism. All that we have proudly labelled “our modern Western civilization” is in the melting pot. The old order is crumbling before our eyes, and who among us will venture to forecast what the new may be? Quite obviously, we are standing at one of the great turning points in the history of the race.

There are, of course, many angles from which the momentous happenings of our time may, and indeed must, be discussed; but at a gathering like this it is a comfort to remember that one does not need to argue the fact that back of all our economic, social, and political questions there is always the primary consideration of the moral requisites involved in the attainment of any truly worthy ends. We here are of one mind that in the final analysis it

still holds true: the improvement of the soul is the soul of all improvement. We believe that it is only in the light of our Christian faith that we can see our real need and find our only adequate help. In one of the last articles that came from his gifted pen President Woodrow Wilson concluded with the statement: “The sum of the matter is this, that our civilization cannot survive materially unless it be redeemed spiritually. It can be saved only by becoming permeated by the spirit of Christ and being made free and happy by the practices which spring from that spirit.” It is from this standpoint that I invite you to consider the subject of Church and State with special reference to the application of Christian, and particularly Calvinistic, principles to those powerful secular forces that today in so many lands are molding national life and international relationships.

The Modern Totalitarian State

The modern state—to come at once to the heart of the matter—has been expanding its functions to an unparalleled extent. In many respects, no doubt, this development has been both desirable and necessary. For as our communal life grows more complex it becomes expedient to delegate more power alike in legislation and in administration to the proper civil authority, be it that of the city, the state, or the national government. I remember that when I first became a resident of the little town in which I live, I could safely

* An address delivered in Atlantic City on February 10, 1942, at the annual meeting of the Western Section of the Alliance of Reformed Churches Throughout the World Holding the Presbyterian System.

cross the main street at any moment I chose; but in these days of automobiles I do so at my peril if I disregard the red light. And this is typical of many other salutary changes that have been taking place in our whole scheme of orderly living. Some municipal services like water, gas, and electricity may perhaps still be furnished as efficiently and economically by private as by public enterprise; but certainly in such fields as transportation, industry and trade, and especially foreign affairs, the enlarged jurisdiction and activity of the national government are quite indispensable.

But many a modern state is going far beyond these wholesome limits. It is practicing something for which a new word has been coined, though the thing itself is in its essence as old as the most ancient autocracy. I mean totalitarianism. This is the doctrine that the state has the right to dominate the entire life of every citizen and of every group of which he is a member; to control the most intimate relationships that he sustains in the family, the school, the club, the business association, the professional circle. Indeed, it challenges claims far more august than its own by daring to regulate the worship, the work, and the witness of the Church of Christ. It is an excessive nationalism that does not hesitate to destroy some of the most sacred rights of personality. It appears in various forms in different countries, but the underlying principle is always the ruthless subordination of the individual in the totality of his being to the absolute authority of the state. In Russia, the development took the form of Communism, the avowed purpose of which is—or at any rate was—to annihilate the Christian religion in favor of Marx's materialistic conception of man and society. In Italy, Fascism in like manner denies any even relative independence to any other sphere of life, according to the dictum of Il Duce: "Nothing against

the state; nothing outside the state; everything for the state." In Germany, Nazism reveals the same connection between this arrogant nationalism and a thoroughgoing dictatorship that controls the radio, the press, the cinema, and all educational agencies and means of propaganda, and in turn receives an adulation that virtually makes Herr Hitler rank with the ancient Caesars to whom divine honor was given. In Japan, the same absolutistic ideas are shaping national policies. Thus in the Far East, as in our Western World, mighty secular forces are working for the triumph of an utterly anti-Christian interpretation of the meaning of human personality and of all our social institutes. This paganism is, to be sure, no new phenomenon in history. Time and again it has pitted its energies in a life-and-death struggle against revealed religion; but it is today an unprecedented danger because of the more highly organized forms of our civilization, with their vastly increased interdependence on one another, and with the ever-present possibility that a few able, determined, and unscrupulous leaders, by monopolizing the new scientific facilities for the communication of ideas, can make their anti-Christian conceptions a bulwark for the totalitarian state.

In emphasizing the menace of these extreme types of modern nationalism I do not forget that, to a considerable extent, they have been due to a natural and justifiable reaction against an unwarranted tyranny of a quite different kind. I refer to the despotism of the Church in the heyday of her worldly power and achievement. Scarcely had she won her epoch-making victory over the Roman Empire, when she promulgated her amazing doctrine of the papacy as the theocratic state, with the pope as the vicegerent of God invested with supreme authority over all other earthly potentates and human interests. It was, indeed, a magnificent imperialism. Nor was it an unmitigated evil.

Ever and again its resources were devoted to charitable enterprises as vast as they were worthy. But often enough the record reminds one that a totalitarian Church can outdo even a totalitarian state in diabolical wickedness. And so the time came when judgment had to begin at the house of God. The Crusades began to level European society. The Renaissance brought a measure of freedom from the oppressions to which the human spirit for centuries had been subjected. In that glorious springtide three new worlds were opened to men's eager scrutinies: the geographical world from the Indies of the East to the Americas of the West; the classical Graeco-Roman world with its rediscovered treasures of art and letters; and the psychological world, the inner realm of man's spirit, the study of which was bound to yield a truer appreciation of the worth of the individual and of the possibilities of the present life as distinguished from the glories promised him by the Church for his celestial future. One by one the more progressive nations began to cast off the papal yoke, asserting their autonomy, first of all, in temporal affairs. Then came the Reformation with its deeper insight into the religious needs of the age and with its deliverance from the spiritual dominion of Rome. But alas! Luther, under the stress of the Peasants' War, lost faith in the common man and committed his Church to the tender mercies—such as they were—of the territorial rulers. Nor could any other of the original Reformers fully realize his ideal of ecclesiastical independence. Long and hard was the struggle for religious freedom, and many a noble victory was won; but too often the Church purchased a partial security by surrendering to the civil authorities the very palladium of her God-given rights and liberties. No wonder that her unfaithfulness gave rise to a nationalism that has scant understanding of, and no love for, the Christian Church.

Calvinistic Principles

We have thus far been considering the totalitarian state simply as a characteristic development of our time. Let us now look at it in the light of our Reformed faith.

Our Calvinistic tradition is here as elsewhere specially valuable just because it most fully and most consistently carried out the evangelical principles of the Reformation. For this reason it became, in the domain of political life, the creator and preserver of civil liberty and constitutional government. As Troeltsch reminds us: "All the Calvinistic peoples are characterized by individualism and democracy, combined with a strong bias towards authority and a sense of the unchangeable nature of law. It is this combination which makes a conservative democracy possible, whereas in Lutheran and Catholic countries, as a matter of course, democracy is forced into an aggressive and revolutionary attitude." How are we to account for this notable difference? We must, I am sure, trace it to the organizing idea of the Calvinistic system—the sovereignty of God over every realm of created being—and to the influence of this majestic truth upon the three fundamental relations of human existence: our relation to God, our relation to our fellow man, and our relation to the world.

God is the one and only Sovereign in the absolute sense. But in his condescending goodness he has been pleased to establish, for the comfort and welfare of mankind, various subordinate authorities, each with a measure of autonomy, but each strictly accountable to himself and fulfilling its divinely appointed function only in so far as it promotes his glory. By his particular or special grace he kindles spiritual life in his elect, making them members of the body of Christ, the Holy Catholic Church, the communion of the faithful. And by his common grace he endows all men, including the unregenerate with manifold gifts and talents, restrains

the power of sin in their hearts and in the world about them, and enables them to form associations of many sorts for the advancement of their common interests. Of the Church I shall speak later, but here I wish to emphasize the epochal significance of this Calvinistic doctrine of common grace. In general, it once for all set aside that erroneous and mischievous teaching of the papacy, that everything beyond the sacramental touch of the hierarchy is under a divine curse. And in particular, it made possible a high and noble conception of the state. Calvin went the length of saying that "civil magistracy is a calling not only holy and legitimate, but far the most sacred and honorable in human life." No doubt, he was often too eager to have the Geneva council take his interpretation of a biblical text as the only possible revelation of the divine will, the result being that time and again he had to endure what he could not cure. Nor could he altogether abandon the baleful practice of a thousand years by which the civil government had to "preserve the pure doctrine of religion" and even inflict capital punishment on archheretics. And though in the decisive issue—that concerning the spiritual freedom of the Church—he was ready to lay down his life rather than let the civil authority determine the proper qualifications for communicant membership, he nevertheless insisted that the state in its own sphere as the guardian of public law and order is supreme.

But this Calvinistic doctrine of common grace had blessings to bestow upon many other social spheres besides the state. It is our Calvinists that have had most to do with the smashing of the equation: the state is the community. They have insisted that history is much more than past politics and that politics is not all there is in present history. The community with all its cultural interests is something more than the state. The state is only one of the many organs that the community employs to realize its varied aims. We are not to minimize

the achievements of our military and naval heroes and our great political leaders, but we must insist that man is not only, in the famous phrase of Aristotle, "a political animal," but also an intellectual, an aesthetic, a social, a moral, and a religious being, and that in all these aspects of his nature he develops special interests for the promotion of which he finds it expedient to fashion all sorts of associations—in athletics, in education, in business, in professional life, in music and art, in literature and science, in philanthropic and religious activities. This theory rightly holds that the community—in the totality of the cultural values represented by these associations—is the central and all-comprehending social sphere; that the community deserves our primary loyalty, so that in case of a conflict we may even have to overthrow the state in order to protect our highest communal interests; and that the community flourishes best when the state most perfectly performs its one and only but indispensable task of serving the community by securing and maintaining the external conditions of social order.

To discharge this function the state must have coercive power. By divine as well as by human law the magistrate must punish evildoers. In the purely internal affairs of the state this truth is so obvious that only in exceptional cases can there be any room for debate. So long as sin continues to make our social relationships abnormal, we shall need our police, our courts, our jails. When capital or labor or any other organized groups adopt violent measures to gain their partisan ends, the community—which after all is the chief sufferer in such cases—may properly insist that the state should intervene for the sake of the injured majority. But more and more we are realizing that mere force cannot of itself rectify the conditions that lead to strife and that it can never clothe the state with omniscience. Let us take a few illustrations. The state may order teachers in its schools to refrain from

inciting students to acts of rebellion against its lawful authority; but it cannot, without destroying freedom of thought, forbid all discussion of such subjects as, let us say, socialism and communism. Colleges and universities, the press and the forum must be permitted to maintain their sovereignties in their special spheres, lest knowledge perish from the earth. The state may, and it alone can, control the property rights of a local church; but it goes beyond its legitimate realm when it undertakes to tell men how they are to worship God, or the clergy how they are to preach the gospel and administer the sacraments. For the Church has her own God-given privileges and duties, and the true Christian will do all he can to maintain the sovereignty of the Church in the interests of religious freedom. The state may establish museums for the exhibition of masterpieces of art, and may regulate the selection of such works on the basis, let us say, of their influence on public morals; but obviously it must leave the creation of art to those whom it pleases God to endow with the requisite talent. Artistic genius always and everywhere authenticates its divinely given sovereignty. The state may encourage men of science by providing them with laboratories and technical facilities, but it has no means of determining for them what their findings shall be. Science must be granted sovereignty in its own proper sphere. In other words, the state may and must concern itself with all the life of the community in some of its aspects, but not with all that life in all its aspects. And today as never before this principle is bound to limit the state in its dealings with these associations that are the really formative and distinctive factors of our civilization and culture. The reason is obvious. Communities are becoming increasingly international in their outlook and in their activities. Industry, trade, science, art, religion—again I am naming only a few of the more important of these communal

interests—are everywhere overleaping the narrow territorial limits to which until quite recently they were confined. For now the world has become just a little neighborhood. It is impossible for any one state to control that large number of associations that extend far beyond its own boundaries and stand in vital fellowship with kindred groups in practically all enlightened nations. Civilization has developed an international community.

But what when international disputes arise and lead to war? Is armed conflict in such cases ever justifiable from a Christian viewpoint? I would speak with all respect of those who answer this question with an unconditional no. But I cannot share their conviction. For when a nation is without provocation ruthlessly attacked by another, is it not the Christian duty of the former to protect itself against the aggressor? Certainly, through the ages the great majority of the followers of Christ, and especially is this true of members of the Reformed Churches, have with a good conscience vindicated for the state the right to wage war in so just a cause. As Archbishop Temple has argued the matter:

The national State acts for a community which is . . . a partnership of many generations, including those yet unborn. The State of our generation, therefore, has not the same right to sacrifice the essential interests of its community as an individual has to sacrifice his own. . . . Not only is the State a trustee for the community, but each national community is a trustee for the world-wide community, to which it should bring treasures of its own; and to submit to political annihilation may be to defraud mankind of what it alone could have contributed to the general wealth of human experience.

But granting that war may be both just and necessary, we have to face the fact that today weighty considerations compel

us to view the problem in a new light. Neither geographical nor political isolation is any longer possible. Totalitarian war means universal war. And as Viscount Grey summed up the catastrophe of twenty-five years ago: "it was the victory of war itself over everybody who took part in it." And so our economists oppose war because under modern conditions it is an economic folly of ever-increasing magnitude. And our humanitarians oppose it as an insensate crime against civilization. And though at this very moment more men are under arms and more wealth is being expended on armaments than at any other time in recorded history, yet this also is true: never before has so much serious thought been given to the question, What can we do to prevent war?

One fact is clearly emerging out of the world-encompassing gloom. Internationalism must supplant nationalism as nationalism long ago supplanted tribalism. The state as the organ of the national community must, by the very logic of its being, look to the creation of an international state that can serve as the appropriate organ of the already existing international community. Our alternatives seem to be ever-recurring world-wide wars or the establishment of an international sovereignty, a supranational state—call it what we may—that will be duly empowered to perform the primary duty of government to protect life and property and promote the common welfare. The international community that has come into being calls for a vastly extended reign of law. States that in their sovereignty now indulge in utter lawlessness, making solemn treaties only to break them, must yield something of their sovereignty to create a world government that by the consent of the governed will establish order and preserve peace on the earth. One by one our sovereign states—as long ago did our helpless colonies—must realize that they are then most like the true and archetypal Sovereign—I mean the only

true and living God—when they humble themselves in love and sacrificial service.

The Function of the Church

And this leads me to a final word concerning the Church. The Church, according to her divine Founder, who is also her ever-living and ever-present Lord, is both the object and the organ of what he so often called the kingdom of heaven; that kingdom which is the rule of God through Christ by the Holy Spirit in the hearts and lives of his redeemed children. Essentially, then, the Church is not a national but a supranational brotherhood. What she was potentially from the very beginning she has now become in actuality—a truly catholic or universal communion. Convinced that beneath king's ermine and archbishop's pallium and professor's gown and soldier's uniform and laborer's jacket and prodigal's rags there is the same sort of human heart with needs that only God can satisfy, the Church makes her appeal to men as men, and thus creates that world-wide community of followers of Christ who purpose to establish here on earth that order of values, relationships, and laws that reflects the spiritual genius of Christianity as the builder of the true city of God, the real commonwealth of humanity.

What, then, does the Church have to say in our present crisis? What contribution can she make to the solution of our problem?

In general, my answer is very simple. Indeed, it is so old-fashioned and familiar that I am afraid its lack of novelty often makes us fail to appreciate its real significance. In a word the Church is that institution which more than any other agency or influence can and does promote international good will and fraternity. She insists that the universalism inherent in the Christian conception of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man must find expression not only in the relation of her many branches to one another

but also in the relation of nations to one another. Her ideal is not the cosmopolitanism that pretends to be superior to the sentiment of nationality, but rather the internationalism that recognizes the necessity and even the desirability of national differences, but resolutely subordinates them all to the unity of the whole family of man to whom she is commissioned to minister.

But in particular, I would say that if the Church is to realize this ideal in a manner more nearly commensurate with the needs of this new age, she must, in the first place, maintain the proper relation between her evangelistic and her educational tasks. Now, as ever, her primary function must be that of preaching the gospel for the salvation of individual sinners. For to have a better social order we must first of all have the spiritually renewed men and women who alone can make it. Not a single one of our economic, industrial, or political problems can ever be solved until we have solved the problem of changing the human heart. Now the Church has the key to this mystery of divine grace, and when she understands her business, she always dares to put first things first, saying, "Verily, ye must be born again." Otherwise, as Jesus goes on to say, a man cannot even see, let alone enter, the kingdom of God. But we need also to remember that regeneration is only the beginning of the Christian life. It is in order to sanctification and service. Though we are not justified by works, yet the faith that justifies is not without works. Too often our religion is specialized into a detached department of life, instead of being made to hallow all our relationships. No doubt, many who today are chiefly concerned about what they call "the Christianizing of our social order" or "the socializing of our Christianity" are putting a one-sided emphasis on a part of the truth and failing to do justice to the prior necessity of getting the right sort of converts. But they are quite right in what they

affirm: personality and community are correlative terms. Neither without the other can be what it ought to be. A Christian can realize himself only in the give-and-take of human intercourse. Only as he accepts the divine will for all the relationships that make up his life is he loyal to him whom he acknowledges as Lord of all. The Church may and must teach totalitarianism in this sense, that the Christian in the totality of his being belongs to Christ—intensively in every realm of the hidden man of the heart, and extensively in all his relationships in the local, the national, and the international community.

But there is a second imperative duty resting upon the Church of today as never before. She must strengthen her corporate witness to the gospel. This would be accomplished in large measure by healing those divisions in her ranks that have now fulfilled whatever good purpose they may have had. Of course, mere bigness is no guarantee of power, nor does true spiritual oneness demand the organic union of all our denominations. But they must come to a better mutual understanding of one another; they must face the fact that the things in which they agree are vastly greater and more important than those in which they still disagree; they must more effectively cooperate with one another in the common task; they must give the unbelieving world a more impressive demonstration of the unity of their faith in him whom they confess as Saviour and Lord.

And lastly, the Church to fulfill her mission must realize more perfectly than she has yet done her absolute dependence upon God. Natural and material resources are not enough to make a more friendly world in which to live. Our humanistic cults and all our boasted scientific achievements only keep throwing us back upon ourselves and convincing us that our wisdom is but folly, our wealth poverty, and our strength weakness. Conferences and alliances, leagues and treaties, civic pro-

grams and ecclesiastical machinery are helpful in their proper places, but quite useless apart from the spiritual dynamic that alone can make an organization into a living organism. Only God is sufficient for us. In shame and penitence, but also in thanksgiving and confidence, we must discover the hidden depths of meaning for our day in the ancient Calvinistic motto *Soli Deo Gloria*. In the Russo-Japanese War some officers came to the Mikado and reported, "Port Arthur cannot be taken." He replied, "Your Emperor expects you to do the impossible." And so it is with the Captain of our salvation. Only let us not imagine that we can accomplish the feat in our own strength. Only super-

natural grace can give us that true blood-brotherhood in Christ that may dare to hope that it can transform the kingdom of this world into the kingdom of our Lord. In him and in him alone all the contradictions of our individual lives and of our social order are reconciled. We shall have peace—peace with God, peace with ourselves, peace with our neighbors, peace among the nations—when we and enough other Christians have learned to put God first, according to the full intent of the angelic strains that heralded the birth of the Prince of Peace: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men."

THE PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL REPORT*

The Passing of Dr. Mackenzie

A few days after the October meeting of the Board of Trustees there passed away in the Princeton Hospital a much beloved member of the Seminary staff in the person of Dr. Donald Mackenzie. Dr. Mackenzie became a professor in this Seminary in the year 1934, succeeding Dr. Geerhardus Vos in the Chair of Biblical Theology. During that time he rendered signal service through the force of his personality, the warmth and ruggedness of his devotion, and the versatile and inspirational character of his lectures. Dr. Mackenzie was passionately devoted to the Seminary and to his work. He was engaged in dressing one morning before setting out to take his usual morning class when he succumbed to weakness. Two weeks later he passed away. A medical autopsy after his death showed that he suffered from an incurable disease that had entered his bloodstream. An account of his death, together with the memorial minute of the Faculty, will be found in

the March number of the *Seminary Bulletin*. He is survived by Mrs. Mackenzie and four children, three daughters and a son, all grown up, to whom our sympathy goes out in their bereavement.

The Department of Field Work

Pursuant to the action of the Board of Trustees a year ago a Department of Field Work was established under the direction of Dr. J. Christy Wilson. This Department has come to fill a long felt need in our Seminary. Building upon the foundations laid by Dr. Harold I. Donnelly before his lamented death, and subsequently to that time by Dr. Edward Howell Roberts and Dr. E. G. Homrighausen, Dr. Wilson has carried forward and developed the Department with very remarkable success. In the special report which he has prepared members of the Board will find data of very great interest regarding the prac-

* Selected passages from the Annual Report of the President of the Seminary to the Board of Trustees.

tical activities in which Seminary students have engaged during the course of the past year. Attention may be drawn, however, to one or two outstanding facts: ninety-four students, including graduates and undergraduates, were student pastors; thirty-five were assistant pastors; fourteen supply pastors; forty-three took part in the Sunday work engaged in by the Choir and the Deputation Teams; twenty-four did some work in connection with Christian Education; and fourteen carried on activities of a miscellaneous character. That is to say, two hundred and twenty-nine students were engaged at one time or another during the academic year in some kind of practical Christian service.

For the first time in the Seminary's history the students engaged in field work have been personally supervised. In the work of supervision Dr. Wilson has had the valuable help of Dr. Roberts and Dr. Homrighausen, each of whom gave several Sundays during the year to circuit work, visiting as many student charges as they could within the time available. It is hoped in this way not only to provide our students with practical experience under the most favorable conditions, but also to bind to the Seminary a large number of congregations. At the same time, all the churches and presbyteries within a considerable radius of Princeton are made to feel that the Seminary exists to help them in their work. These constitute our immediate Seminary parish just as, from another point of view, the whole country and the world are our parish when we take into account the far-flung areas in which our graduates eventually settle.

The Church and Her Seminaries

This year will also be memorable for the fact that, for the first time in at least eighty years, a special offering was made throughout the Church for theological education. While the amount contributed for this cause was smaller than had been an-

ticipated, the Church began to become conscious of her responsibility towards those institutions in which her ministers, her board secretaries and her national and foreign missionaries are prepared. From this offering Princeton Seminary has received some \$3,000. Now, however, that the theological seminaries have been placed upon the general benevolent budget of the Church, it is hoped that a substantial amount may become available year by year for the use of this Seminary and the other seminaries of the Church, in order that they may be able to carry on their work, not merely as an integral, but also as a foundational, aspect of the Church's activity.

The Forward Movement

It will be recommended to the Board at this meeting that the work of the Forward Movement, which has been directed so ably for the last few years by Dr. Henry Seymour Brown, shall now be considered a normal aspect of the Seminary's activity and the expenses connected therewith be absorbed into the regular Seminary budget. This action of the Administrative Committee meets with my heartiest approval. I trust, moreover, that the great new interest in theological education, and in Princeton Seminary in particular, which Dr. Brown has been able to arouse throughout the Church, may enable us to finance out of the regular budget of the Seminary the work carried on by Dr. Brown.

The Whitely Bequest

There was still another event for which the past year will be memorable. We have received in the course of the last few months our largest contribution to date toward the Student Center Building, in the form of a bequest for \$50,000 from the late Miss Ida Whitely. Miss Whitely made her final decision to write the Seminary into her will as a result of a visit paid to the First Presbyterian Church of York

some two years ago by Dr. Brown and the members of the Seminary Choir. We trust that this bequest will prove to be a forerunner of many others to follow, now that the great cause for which the Seminary stands is again being taken to heart by men and women throughout our Presbyterian Church.

The Student Body

As was indicated in my report to the Board last October we have had this last year the second largest enrollment in the history of the Seminary, two hundred and fifty-seven students in all, of whom fifty-seven were graduate students. A sense of institutional solidarity, to which I have had occasion to refer from time to time in the course of the last few years, has been particularly marked during the year which has come to an end. The diverse background of birthplace and college, the division into classes and clubs has been merged into a great, common seminary spirit. This has been manifested especially in the Student Council which has shown itself willing and able to assume a great deal of responsibility in the routine conduct of campus life. Particularly helpful have been the Retreats, five of which were held in the course of the year at St. Martin's House, Bernardsville. The greater participation of students in dealing with basic Seminary problems has been a matter of great gratification to me personally and to the members of the Faculty.

The Doctor of Theology Degree

Members of the Faculty have been greatly gratified by the increased interest in graduate work. Despite the fact that the conditions for admission to candidacy for the Doctor of Theology degree in Princeton Seminary are exceedingly exacting, eighteen students are engaged in study looking toward this degree. Of these two have completed their residence requirements: eight are in process of fulfilling these require-

ments; while eight are preparing to take the preliminary examinations. As may well be supposed, the increased number of graduate students and the more advanced work required of the professors to meet the needs of men studying for the Doctor's degree, put a very heavy burden upon our Faculty. They have, however, the compensating pleasure of knowing that such is the good name enjoyed by teachers in Princeton Seminary that outstanding students belonging to our own and other churches are eager to sit at their feet, and to be oriented in the diverse realms of theological study by the light of the great tradition for which Princeton stands.

The Library

You will observe from the Librarian's report that the number of books in circulation during the last year constitutes a record in the Seminary's history. It is exceedingly gratifying to find that the expansion of our students' interest in field work coincides with the expansion of their intellectual interest in reading and consulting books in connection with their class work. Dr. Gapp, our Librarian, is to be congratulated upon the fine constructive work he is doing in our great Library. He is following worthily in the steps of the men who preceded him in that office, showing great insight in the selection of volumes, fine organizing ability in recataloging the books and pamphlets that form our collection, and in making the resources of our Library available to the largest possible extent to those who wish to avail themselves of its treasures. In this connection, our thanks are due to Mr. John H. Scheide for his contributions to the Library in the course of the year. The special committee of the Board has been at work restudying the whole library problem. An outstanding firm of library architects has been called into consultation, and plans are being drawn up to present at some future date to the Board, outlining a scheme

whereby the growing need of the Library for more space and larger quarters may be constructively dealt with.

Special Lectureships

The Stone Lectures were delivered this year by The Rev. Thomas C. Pears, Jr., L.H.D., Manager of the Department of History of the office of the General Assembly, who gave a most interesting course under the general theme "This American Wilderness." In this series Dr. Pears has broken new ground in colonial, and particularly Presbyterian, Church History, which I trust will bear fruit in stimulating the further study of this great and important field.

The Mission Lectures were given by Dr. Basil Mathews, Professor of Christian World Relations in the Andover Newton Seminary and one of the most distinguished of present day writers on missionary topics. His subject was "Christian Leadership Toward World Community."

Days of Prayer and Meditation

This year two special days were devoted to the things of the spirit, during which all classes were suspended. On October 22, just as the Seminary year was getting under way, Faculty and students engaged in a special Day of Prayer and Intercession. Prayer was made the special subject of meditation, while intercession was engaged in for special groups and areas of human life in this country and across the world. A Day of Convocation was held on February 4, under the leadership of Dr. Harris Elliott Kirk of Baltimore. This was a day of intellectual and spiritual stimulus under the leadership of one of the most outstanding of America's ministers.

Relations with the University

Relations with the University have continued to be cordial and cooperative. The President of the Seminary had the privilege of taking part in the University

forum on religion which was held last October, and preached the sermon on Easter Sunday in the University Chapel. He has also been elected a member of the new Advisory Council in the Department of Philosophy. Professor E. Harris Harbison, of the Department of History, a distinguished Presbyterian on the University Faculty, will take part in the Institute of Theology next July.

Chair of Biblical Theology Becomes a Chair of English Bible

I trust that at this meeting the Board will adopt the recommendation that comes to it from both the Curriculum and Administrative Committees that the Chair of Biblical Theology be transformed into a Chair of English Bible.¹ It has become evident to the Faculty and the Board, as well as to our Alumni, that the material dealt with under the name of Biblical Theology can most appropriately be treated as part of the work of the Old and New Testament Departments. The fact that the professors of both these chairs have been deprived for some decades of the privilege of dealing with the deeper spiritual and thought aspects of Biblical study, tended to limit the scope of these two basic chairs to historical, linguistic, and purely exegetical matters. The inclusion in the work of each of a basic course in Biblical Theology will now give the professors concerned the privilege of launching forth, as is their right, into the deeper phases of Biblical thought.

There will remain, however, this most crucial problem, namely, how to make good the deficiency in Biblical knowledge with which very many students come to Seminary, by providing them during their Seminary course with basic and systematic knowledge of the contents of the English Bible.

What we obviously need is a man capable of giving instruction in the English

¹ This action was duly taken.

Bible with as much power, conviction and pedagogical skill as we find in the best Bible School teachers and, at the same time, with truer insight than these, and without the vagaries in Biblical interpretation which they frequently manifest. If we are to deal constructively with the problem that the Bible Schools have created for the Church, and are, in addition, to make our future ministers men of one Book in the loftiest and noblest sense of that term, we must have an unusual man to be the new teacher of English Bible. He should, of course, have a good working knowledge of Hebrew and Greek; insight into the unfolding Revelation of God in Holy Scripture; a vivid imagination in order to make the great personalities, the great events, the great ideas and the great episodes of the Bible live in the thought of his students; didactic skill to communicate Biblical truth; and a method of approach which students could acquire from their teacher and make use of in their own study and preaching of the Word of God.

The Seminary's Rôle in Time of War

It is difficult to know how many students we shall enroll next year. Members of the Board will be pleased to learn that the ap-

plications to date encourage us to believe that the situation upon the campus will be more normal as regards students than we had dared to hope some months ago. It would be a calamity if the ranks of the Christian ministry were thinned in these years of terrible anguish. Ministers are needed today not only to supply the normal needs of the Church, but also to man an increasing number of chaplaincy positions in the army and navy. Moreover, when the present battles are over and the battle for a lasting peace has begun, a distraught world, destined to live an abnormal existence for many years to come, will have more need than ever before, in home parishes and missionary frontiers, for well equipped and deeply consecrated servants of Christ. In view of that need, we trust that our Seminary may function in its own realm with the same efficiency and the same pulsating life as do our great war industries. As they provide the means to destroy organized evil in the political realm, we must provide men to lay the foundations, to build the walls, and to organize the life, of a new order of goodness, modelled upon the pattern and inspired by the light of God's everlasting Truth.

COMMENCEMENT 1942

HARRY E. ULRICH '17

THE Alumni Dinner of Princeton Theological Seminary was called to order on the evening of May the Eighteenth in the University Gymnasium at 6:45 o'clock. The Vice President, Dr. George Talbott of Passaic, New Jersey, presided in the absence of the president of the Association, Dr. Herbert Booth Smith, who was prevented from being at the dinner because of the necessity of presiding at the meeting of the General Council in Milwaukee. A letter from Dr. Smith was read expressing his regret at not being able to preside at this meeting. Dr. Henry Seymour Brown offered the Invocation, opening the dinner, which was attended by 305 members and friends of the Alumni.

Immediately following the very appetizing and satisfying meal, Dr. Erdman, in his inimitable manner led the group in singing the old favorites of the Seminary. This group singing has become one of the fixed traditions of the Alumni Dinner and is looked forward to with great pleasure by all who attend.

Dr. Erdman then presented the Treasurer's Report. It was received. Dr. Talbott called for the report of the Executive Council in reference to the nominations for the coming year. The report presented by Dr. McCrone was adopted and the following officers were elected as suggested by the Council: For President, Dr. George H. Talbott, of Passaic, New Jersey; Vice President, Dr. Hunter Bryson Blakely, Jr., President of Queen's College, Charlotte, North Carolina; Secretary, Dr. Frederick Schweitzer of Ridley Park, Pennsylvania; Treasurer, Dr. Charles R. Erdman of Princeton, New Jersey. Members of the Council elected for three years: Dr. Ralph B. Nesbitt of New York City, and Dr. A. Brown Caldwell of Baltimore, Maryland.

In presenting Dr. McCrone, previous to the making of the report of the Council, Dr. Talbott called attention to the splendid and remarkable service which the retiring President of the Council had given to the Association during the twelve years that he occupied the office. An enthusiastic and appreciative rising vote of thanks by all present in recognition of the unusual contribution which Dr. McCrone had made to the Alumni Association as head of the Executive Council was given. A ruling that no one be allowed to serve for more than six years on the Council necessitated Dr. McCrone's retirement. Dr. McCrone will be succeeded by Dr. Arthur N. Butz of the Prospect Presbyterian Church, Maplewood, N.J., a member of the Class of 1914.

The Alumni Choir of the Seminary then sang several sacred numbers under the direction of Dr. David Hugh Jones, leader of the Seminary Choir. Following this an interesting feature of the Alumni Dinner was the introducing of the five year classes.

Dr. Talbott then called upon Dr. Edward Howell Roberts, Dean of Students, to read the list of the Seminary graduates who were Chaplains in the armed service of the country, or who were officers of the line. The name of Chaplain George Snavelly Rentz was read as one who had lost his life in February with the sinking of the U.S.S. *Houston*. With this in mind Dr. Williamson of the Westminster Choir College led the group in the singing of "America," after which Dr. Robert E. Speer offered the memorial prayer. At this point in the program a motion was passed instructing the secretary to write letters of sympathy to the widow and family of Dr. Joseph B. C. Mackie, who had passed away in the month of January.

Then followed the presentation of Pres-

ident John A. Mackay who spoke in his usual interesting and fascinating manner concerning the things close to his heart in reference to the Seminary and its life and work. Dr. Mackay asked all the members of the Seminary Faculty to rise, introducing each one of them to the dinner guests. He also presented in a gracious and kindly manner the Commencement speaker, Dr. Henry John Cody, President of Toronto University. The guest speaker of the evening was Henning Webb Prentis, Jr., LL.D., President of the Armstrong Cork Company of Lancaster, Pa. Dr. Prentis delivered a challenging, thrilling and interesting address on the subject of the "Foundations of American Liberty," which was enthusiastically received and applauded. The Benediction was pronounced by Dr. John VanEss of Arabia, Class of 1902. These exercises presented a happy and delightful opportunity for companionship and inspiration to all who were present.

The Commencement Exercises were held as usual in the University Chapel, being inaugurated with the colorful academic procession led by the students of the Westminster Choir College in their wine colored cassocks and white surplices. The members of the college add much color and beauty to this wonderful service each year. On this occasion they contributed greatly to the service by their rendering of "Let All Mortal Flesh Keep Silence," an Old French Carol by Butcher, and the well-known "Hallelujah Chorus" from "The Messiah." They were directed in their singing by Dr. Williamson, President of the Choir College.

Dr. Robert E. Speer, '93, President of the Board of Trustees, presided and offered the Invocation. The Scripture les-

son was read by The Rev. Minot C. Morgan, D.D., '00, and the Prayer was offered by The Rev. Frank Sergeant Niles, '13. The Class Hymn of the graduating class "A Mighty Fortress is Our God" was sung by the Congregation and Class. Dr. Speer presented the Honorable and Reverend Henry John Cody, LL.D., D.D., D.C.L., who spoke on the subject, "The Challenge of Stern Days." Dr. Cody's message was everything that the subject could suggest and was filled with interest, inspiration and courage for all who heard it. There followed the Announcement of Fellowships and Prizes, the Conferring of Degrees by the President of the Seminary, and the latter's words of farewell to the new graduates. A departure from Dr. Mackay's usual custom was noticed in the fact that instead of offering helpful advice, he read letters from two members of the graduating class who had already entered into the armed service of their country. It was a solemn moment filled with deep meaning.

Following the Prayer and Benediction offered by Dr. John B. Laird, '95, the Choral Benediction was sung and the Recessional concluded another significant and historic graduation service of our old Seminary.

Each year this service becomes more beautiful, more inspirational, and more helpful. In a war year such as this, its great message and wholesome significance sent one out into the world with a deep feeling not only of the problems of life, but also of the contributing corollary thought, that the religion of our Living Lord is the only hope for a world torn apart by national greed and selfish hate.

PRINCETON SEMINARY ALUMNI IN THE ARMED FORCES

Chaplains

Armstrong, Andrew T. L. '39
 Bergen, Hansen '15
 Blackwood, A. W., Jr. '40
 Bradley, W. Roy '15
 Brink, E. C. '30
 Brown, Allan H. '14
 Buswell, K. P. '27
 Carley, Robert H. '42
 Castleman, Dayton, Jr. '39
 Churchill, C. O. '34
 Coddington, David L. '36
 Cropp, Frederick W., Jr. '29
 Crothers, Samuel D. '42
 DeKracker, Cecil H. '34
 Downes, R. D. '39
 Driscoll, Roland D. '35
 Eells, Earnest E. '17
 Faust, Milton B. '37
 Forgy, Howell M. '37
 Geitner, Emil W. '30
 Goff, James E. '42
 Griffing, A. H. '34
 Groendyk, Albertus '37
 Hartfelter, Stewart W. '38
 Hayward, Harold D. '33
 Helwig, F. W. '27
 Hindman, Lloyd S. '38
 Holt, Maurice R. '36
 Hook, Cornelius '36
 Johnson, John E. '24
 Kaufman, Jay W. '36
 King, J. Norman '09
 Lam, A. Paul '39
 Leavens, Paul '24
 Logan, Robert Lee '19
 MacDonald, John B. '33
 Markle, George L. '26
 Martin, Ivan G. '05
 Maxwell, E. N. '38
 McAdoo, William A. '32
 McBride, James L. '05
 McCartney, Albert J. '03

McClellan, Harvey H. '24
 Miller, Frank L. '17
 Moore, J. W. '14
 Mouw, Gerritt E. '30
 Munro, K. B. '40
 Nicholas, Philip '30
 Osborne, Arthur R. '33
 Paulson, E. Edwin '28
 Pierce, Walter '23
 Prugh, Charles M. '31
 Ramaker, Gerald '32
 Shoemaker, E. A. '35
 Shoffstall, Elvin H. '23
 Solla, Andrew G. '26
 Suetterlein, F. L. '38
 Thackaberry, S. J. '34
 Tiffany, Frank L. '32
 Vincent, W. G. '37
 Wallace, Eunace A. '26
 Wheeler, Ralph K. '34
 White, Rowland H. '32
 Wideman, C. E. '31
 Wilbanks, Thomas W. '37
 Willard, W. Wyeth '31
 Williams, Frank Richard '36
 Witt, E. Talmadge '14
 Wood, Harry C. '36
 Workman, Robert D. '15
 Wright, Leigh O. '20
 Wylie, David R. '16
 Wylie, Samuel J. Jr. '39
 Young Russell Earl '42

In Combat Service

Corum, Frederick M. '40
 Davies, G. Douglas '37
 Devanny, E. H. '20
 Felmeth, W. H. '42
 Logan, William Fox, Jr. '39
 Peters, Albert '37
 Porter, Robert '43
 Strandness, H. '38

We regret that it is not possible for us to give a complete list of all our alumni in the service. But, even with this partial list, we find that at Commencement time approximately half of the number of Presbyterian chaplains in active service in the United States Army and Navy were alumni of the Seminary. We should appreciate receiving necessary corrections. In addition to the above list, a large number of alumni have applied for the chaplaincy. Many of these have been approved by the Committee of the General Assembly on Army and Navy Chaplains and are awaiting word from Washington.

ROLL OF HONOR

CHAPLAIN GEORGE RENTZ

The first alumnus of Princeton Seminary to lose his life in the present war is George Rentz of the Class of 1909. Chaplain Rentz was the spiritual father and friend of the crew of the U.S.S. *Houston*, and was lost with that ship when she was sunk in the south seas.

George Rentz graduated from Mercersburg Academy and Gettysburg College before coming to Princeton Seminary in 1906. Our deepest sympathy goes out to Mrs. Rentz in her bereavement, while our prayer goes up to God that He will raise up many other Princeton Seminary men to supply the armed services of the nation with strong, God-fearing chaplains like George Rentz.

DEGREES, FELLOWSHIPS AND PRIZES

The degree of Bachelor of Theology was conferred upon the following students who hold the degree of Bachelor of Arts or its academic equivalent, from an approved institution, and who have completed the course of study prescribed therefor in this Seminary:

Clyde Monroe Allison
 Frederick James Thomson Allsup
 Irvin Wesley Batdorf
 P. Arthur Brindisi
 Robert Hillis Carley
 James Rose Carroll
 Arnold Bruce Come
 Samuel Dunlap Crothers
 Varre Allis Cummins
 Howard Lewis Davies
 Roland Gralapp deVries
 Ernest Charles Enslin
 William Luzerne Everhart
 Floyd Woodrow Ewalt
 William Harte Felmeth
 Paul Russell Fisk
 Chester Archibald Galloway
 James Ernest Goff
 William Van Doren Grosvenor
 Richard Christian Halverson
 Plummer Robb Harvey
 Arthur Clarence Haverly
 Alvin Blair Henry
 Joseph Curtis Hodgens

John Frederick Jansen
 William Reynaldo Johnston
 Edward Jabra Jurji
 Russell Martin Kerr
 Lee V. Kliever
 William George Kuhen
 James Taylor McHendry
 Roger Burnham McShane
 Hugh McHenry Miller
 Samuel Hugh Moffett
 James Forester Moore
 Edward Holden Morgan
 Fred Bruce Morgan, Jr.
 Andrew Evans Murray
 Harlan Henry Naylor
 Wilson Burney Overton
 John Pott
 Frederick Somers Price, Jr.
 Charles Percival Robshaw
 Edward Louis Schalk
 Herman Reinhard Schuessler
 John Willis Shearer
 Roy Martin Shoaf
 William Gill Silbert, Jr.
 Arthur Beverly Smith
 Richard Lloyd Smith
 S. Arthur Talman
 Herbert Fergus Thomson
 Bruce Grafton Tucker
 Ansley Gerard Van Dyke
 Gustavus Warfield
 Edwin Richard Weidler

Robert A. D. Whitesides
 Frank Huston Esselstyn Wood
 David Brainerd Woodward
 George Hileman Yount

Antonio Serrano
 Robert Edward Sherrill
 Olaf Kenneth Storaasli
 Russell Earl Young

The degree of Master of Theology was conferred upon the following students who hold the degree of Bachelor of Arts, or its academic equivalent, and the degree of Bachelor of Theology, or its theological equivalent, from approved institutions, and who have completed the course of study prescribed therefor in this Seminary:

Robert Adkins Allen
 Donald Bennett Bailey
 Georges Augustin Barrois
 William Carl Bogard
 Doyle William Brewington
 James Creighton Christman
 John Pallai Dany
 Elie Fritz de Lattre
 James Herbert Gailey, Jr.
 John Maurice Hohlfeld
 Robert Molyneaux Hunt
 Merrill Roland Nelson
 John Lawrence Reid, Jr.

Fellowships and Prizes were awarded as follows:

The Fellowship in Old Testament to
 Roger Burnham McShane
 The Fellowship in New Testament to
 Irvin Wesley Batdorf
 The Fellowship in Systematic Theology to
 John Frederick Jansen
 The Fellowship in Ecumenics to
 Samuel Hugh Moffett
 The First Scribner Prize in New Testament Literature to
 Robert A. D. Whitesides
 The Second Scribner Prize to
 George Hileman Yount
 The Hugh Davies Prize in Homiletics to
 Samuel Hugh Moffett
 The Benjamin Stanton Prize in Old Testament Literature to
 Robert Emil Hansen

THE FORWARD MOVEMENT

HENRY SEYMOUR BROWN

FOR the third successive year, the Seminary closed its books this year with a balanced budget and no deficit. The living endowment from contributing friends is slowly but surely growing, receipts during this fiscal year being the largest in many, many years—\$17,541.42. This is over \$4,000 more than last year, and \$3,500 more than the year before. The churches contributed the largest part of this sum—198 churches contributed \$9,660.99, over \$3,000 of which came from the offerings taken in our churches on Seminary Sunday, November 9, 1941. The response from the churches has been more encouraging than ever this year, 82 new churches having been added to our list and 35 contributing \$100 or more.

The year 1942-43 is the first year since 1850 that theological seminaries have a column in the General Assembly Minutes and a percentage share of 2% in the benevolence quota from each church. (Princeton Seminary will receive 26% of the receipts.) This 2% will in no way affect the amounts designated by churches and individuals to particular seminaries. All the gifts that come to the seminaries from churches, designated or undesignated, will be credited on their quotas.

By the end of the fiscal year on May 31, 1942 the total for the Forward Movement had reached \$255,471.48, with the total cash paid in by June 30 amounting to \$221,684. The Investment Committee is investing the cash designated for the Student Center Building Fund so that the income therefrom may be added to the principal until such time as we are able to begin the erection of this building.

The Seminary Choir has now completed its fifth year of service to the Seminary, having visited 281 different churches dur-

ing that period. We traveled over five thousand miles this year to 74 different churches; our collections amounted to \$3,480.17, and our books show a balance of \$125.79 with all bills paid. To date this year 24 new members have been added to the company of the "Friends of Princeton" as a direct result of the program, and a check for \$1,000 was recently received from a woman (not a Presbyterian) whose first introduction to the needs of Princeton Seminary was through the Choir program. Evidence has also been given again this year that the program is a valuable instrument in the matter of recruiting young men for the Christian ministry. It is hoped that we will be able to continue the program next year, but of course the transportation problem may prevent us from carrying on as in the past.

The Annual Pilgrimage was attended by over 100 registered delegates on May 2, in spite of the difficulties of transportation due to tire and gasoline shortages. President Mackay made a brief speech of welcome and Mr. Kenneth Lanning and Dr. Edward B. Hodge both made most helpful and effective addresses, speaking as elders to elders who love the Church and are deeply interested in the best leadership possible for our churches.

One of the most valuable means of general promotion of the Seminary's cause is the Seminary film and accompanying comments. Such programs have been presented in several churches this year, and much interest was aroused and groups of "Friends of Princeton" started. Arrangements have already been made for some meetings in the fall. The film and speaker will be available for Wednesday or other evening meetings where the entire problem of the seminaries can be discussed.

Any prophecies concerning receipts this coming year can only be what Hanson Baldwin calls "guesstimates" and are of no value. One thing is certain—everything must give place to the War needs. Our life-saver will be the 2% in the budget of

the churches. It is of the Lord's doing that in this War year, when the draft will decrease the number of young men preparing for the ministry, the attention of the entire Church will be focused upon the seminaries and their needs.

SEMINARY ENROLLMENT IN WAR TIME

EDWARD H. ROBERTS

MANY are asking, Is the War affecting the Seminary enrollment? Are any students leaving for the service? What about the entering class in the Fall?

In this war great emphasis is being placed upon the importance of each man occupying that position where he can be of the greatest service. It was for this reason that Congress, when framing the Selective Service Act, stipulated that duly ordained ministers of religion and students who are preparing for the ministry in theological or divinity schools are exempted from training and service. It is for this reason, too, that the great majority of students in the theological seminaries of the country are finishing their training before offering their services. We have heard of a few who, after graduation waived exemption and entered the combatant ranks. Some, three of the Class of 1942 of Princeton Seminary, became chaplains in the navy. Practically all of the remaining members of the class have assumed pastorates in order that the greatly depleted home front may be properly manned. It appears that in the coming year the Middle and Senior classes will be practically unaffected. But what of the entering class?

There has been much confusion among local draft boards in regard to the deferment of candidates for the ministry now

in our colleges and universities. While the majority of the local draft boards were giving deferment, some boards were maintaining that they had no authority to take such action. It was for this reason that a committee was appointed by the American Association of Theological Schools and authorized to urge upon General Hershey and the Selective Service System the need of a memorandum for the guidance of the local draft boards. Such a memorandum was released by General Hershey on June the 22nd, 1942, and is here reproduced in full. It is in line with the instructions given local boards regarding the deferment of premedical students and other groups essential to the total war effort.

June 22, 1942

Occupational Bulletin (No. 11)
Subject: Pretheological Students
Effective: Immediately

Part I

1. Regular or duly ordained ministers of religion and students who are preparing for the ministry in theological or divinity schools (which schools have been recognized for more than one year prior to September 16, 1940) are exempted from training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

2. In giving deferment to regular or duly ordained ministers of religion and to students studying for the ministry in recognized theo-

logical schools, Congress has recognized the necessity of religious guidance and education as vital to the welfare of the Nation.

PART II

1. Many religious denominations and many theological or divinity schools require that a student complete a full course of academic study in a recognized university or college as a prerequisite to entering a recognized theological or divinity school. A student in training and preparation in a recognized university or college who is studying for the ministry will pursue a course of study which will include cultural subjects, with certain specific subjects designed to contribute to his qualification as a minister, and upon graduation will normally acquire a degree of Bachelor of Arts.

PART III

1. Upon information received from reliable sources, it appears that there is generally a shortage of persons trained, qualified, or skilled as regular or duly ordained ministers of religion, and that, in addition, there is a shortage of students studying for the ministry in recognized theological or divinity schools. It is realized that in order to maintain a supply of students in recognized theological or divinity schools and thus assure a sufficient supply of regular or duly ordained ministers of religion it is necessary that a sufficient number of students acquire prerequisite training and preparation in recognized universities and colleges.

PART IV

1. A registrant who is in training and preparation and who is pursuing academic studies for the ministry in a recognized university or college may not be considered for occupational classification until the close, or approximately the close, of his second or sophomore year in a recognized university or college.

2. A registrant who is in training and preparation and who is pursuing academic studies for the ministry in a recognized university or college may be considered for occupational classification at the close, or approximately at the close, of his second or sophomore year in a recognized university or college if he is pursuing a course of academic study upon the successful completion of which he will have acquired the necessary training, qualification, or skill, and if he gives promise of continuing and will be acceptable for continuing such course of study and will undertake actual further classroom work within a period of not to exceed four months from the close of

his second year, provided that, in addition, there should be furnished the certifications referred to in paragraph 4 of this Part.

3. A registrant who is in training and preparation and who is pursuing academic studies for the ministry in a recognized university or college may be considered for occupational classification during his third and fourth years in a recognized university or college, provided that he gives promise of the successful completion of such course of study and the acquiring of the necessary degree of training, qualification, or skill, and provided, further, that there should be furnished the certifications referred to in paragraph 4 of this Part.

4. A registrant who is pursuing a course of academic study in a recognized university or college as a prerequisite to entering a recognized theological or divinity school cannot be easily distinguished from other students pursuing academic studies. For this reason, it is advisable in considering the occupational classification of such a registrant that there should be required two certificates, one certificate from a recognized theological or divinity school to the effect that upon the registrant's successful completion of his prerequisite academic studies he will be accepted and enrolled in the theological or divinity school, and the other from a recognized church, religious sect, or religious organization to the effect that the registrant is pursuing his prerequisite academic studies in a recognized university or college under the direction and supervision of such recognized church, religious sect, or religious organization.

(signed) LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

Pastors should keep a copy of this memorandum for handy reference when advising young men who intend to enter the ministry. They should advise them about being taken under the care of Presbytery at once and about applying for admission to the seminary of their choice at or near the the close of their sophomore year in college. With a statement from Presbytery indicating that the student is under its care and a letter from a recognized theological seminary accepting him on the proviso that he complete his prerequisite academic studies successfully, the student should normally be deferred. If

this is not done he can file an appeal with the local appeal board. His final court of appeal is the President.

In recent weeks some of the local draft boards have been questioning whether a college student is really a candidate for the ministry if his college transcript does not indicate a preponderance of courses in Bible, religion and related subjects. In this connection it should be pointed out that in the judgment of the American Association of Theological Schools "the appropriate foundation for a minister's later

professional studies lies in a broad and comprehensive college education, while the normal place for a minister's professional studies is the theological school." The emphasis should be "on a 'liberal arts' program," rather than on the elements commonly known as 'pre-professional.'"

At the present time it appears that the entering class in the Fall of 1942 will be as large as usual. There is a dearth of ministers for the chaplaincy and for the churches at home. We must train still more and still better men.

SEMINARY NOTES

PAYNE HALL

Payne Hall, in its twentieth year of service, has provided a home during furlough period for the following missionaries and their families: D. W. Brewington of Guatemala; D. C. Buchanan of Japan; Otto DeCamp of Korea; F. M. Grissett of Africa; A. H. Kepler of China; W. H. Lyon of India; E. L. Pederson of India; A. A. Pieters of Korea; S. P. Seaton of China; D. B. Van Dyck of China; John Van Ess of Iraq; H. Voelkel of Korea.

PREACHERS AND LECTURERS

On the invitation of the Faculty, the following preached in Miller Chapel on Tuesday evenings during 1941-42:

The Rev. Herbert Booth Smith, D.D., Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., pastor of Immanuel Church, Los Angeles.

The Rev. Charles E. Diehl, D.D., Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U.S., President of Southwestern, Memphis, Tenn.

The Rev. Clarence Edward Macartney, D.D., pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.

The Rev. Henry Sloane Coffin, D.D., President of Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

Addresses were delivered before the student body by:

Mr. John Ritchie of the American Bible Society, Lima, Peru, on "Missions in Peru."

Dr. Frank Laubach of the Philippine Islands on "The Game of Minutes."

Dr. John Van Ess of Arabia on "The Transfiguration."

Dr. Samuel Rizzo, pastor of St. Paul's Presbyterian Church, Newark, New Jersey, on "Missions in Brazil."

Dame Christabel Pankhurst, formerly woman suffragist leader in England, on "Prophecy."

Dr. Otis C. Rice, Episcopal Rector at St. Luke's Hospital, New York City, on "The Minister in the Hospital."

Mr. Tracy Strong, General Secretary, Y.M.C.A., Geneva, Switzerland, on "The Role of the Prisoner of War."

Mr. James Myers, Industrial Secretary of the Federal Council of Churches of

Christ in America on "The Church and Organized Labor."

The Rev. Stewart M. Robinson, D.D., pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Elizabeth, N.J., on "The Army Chaplaincy."

Captain Robert D. Workman, Chief Chaplain, U.S. Navy, on "The Navy Chaplaincy."

DEATH OF TRUSTEES

Since the publication of the last Bulletin in March the Seminary has had to lament the death of two lay members of the Board of Trustees, Mr. J. Willison Smith of Philadelphia, and Dr. J. M. T. Finney of Baltimore. A minute upon Mr. Smith appears in this issue. In next issue a special notice will be published of the life and service to the Seminary of the beloved Baltimore surgeon.

MRS. FRANCIS LANDEY PATTON

We regretfully announce the death of Mrs. Francis Landey Patton, who passed away at her home in Bermuda on April 5, 1942, at the advanced age of ninety-five years.

NEW TRUSTEES

At the May meeting of the Board of Trustees two new lay members were elected to the Board, their elections being subsequently confirmed by the General Assembly. These were Mr. R. J. Dearborn, an elder in the Central Presbyterian Church, Summit, N.J., and Mr. Henry E. Hird, an elder in the West Side Presbyterian Church, Ridgewood, N.J.

TRUSTEE HONORED

The Rev. Stuart Nye Hutchison, D.D., of the East Liberty Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, Pa., was elected Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. at its 154th session in Milwaukee, Wis., May 1942.

DR. MCCRONE RESIGNS PRESIDENCY OF THE COUNCIL

After twelve years of most fruitful service, for which Princeton Seminary is deeply his debtor, Dr. Hugh B. McCrone has resigned the Presidency of the Alumni Council. One of the outstanding achievements of Dr. McCrone during his term of office was the organization of the Alumni Fall Conference, which has meant so much for a number of years in the life of the Alumni in the Eastern States.

On the occasion of his retirement the following letter was sent to Dr. McCrone by Dr. Frederick Schweitzer, Secretary of the Council:

June 19, 1942

The Rev. Hugh B. McCrone, D.D.
The Lenox
13th and Spruce Streets
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Dear Dr. McCrone:

By direction of the Alumni Council of Princeton Theological Seminary, I wish to convey to you upon your retirement as President of the Council the deep appreciation of the Alumni for the unusual contribution that you have made to the life of the Seminary and its graduates during the twelve years you have occupied the office of President. Your dignified appearance and pleasing personality and unexcelled good taste has lent an air to our gatherings which has been spoken of on many occasions. The judgment you have exercised, the fairness you have shown, and the courtesy which is so characteristic of you have set a standard which will be difficult to emulate. It is deeply regretted that the six-year rule made necessary your retirement.

On behalf of your fellow Alumni and officers of the Seminary I express our deep appreciation of your service and our earnest hope that you may be spared many years in which to grace our gatherings with your presence.

With cordial good wishes, I am,

Faithfully yours,

Frederick Schweitzer
Secretary

NEW GIFT FOR STUDENT CENTER

A new gift of twenty thousand dollars has been received for the Student Center Fund. The generous donor is Miss Jessie Munger, who is a member of the First Presbyterian Church of Plainfield, and a benefactress of many educational institutions in this country. A number of years ago she gave to Wellesley College campus one of its finest and most useful buildings, now known as Munger Hall.

It was a striking coincidence that Miss Munger's gift, together with a very gracious letter from herself, were received on the day that the Institute of Theology closed. The announcement formed a fitting climax to ten marvelous days. The members of the Institute had had ample occasion to sense the need for some place on the campus where they could sit down to a common meal and hold intercourse together in a way worthy of the family spirit which had been bred in the hearts of all.

Although government regulations now prevent anything being done to erect even a single unit of the Student Center, it is our earnest desire that when the priorities ban is lifted we may have in our possession the needed funds to proceed immediately to the erection of the building.

ANNUAL ALUMNI CONFERENCE

At a meeting of the Executive Council of the Alumni Association it was decided that in view of the holding of the Princeton Institute of Theology in July the Autumn Alumni Conference be omitted this year. The Council is exploring the possibility of combining this conference with the annual Seminary Convocation Day, February 3rd, when the students meet for the thoughtful and prayerful consideration of the great truths of our religion and the perplexing problems of our day. Due notice will be sent out when a decision has been reached.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS

Dr. Edward H. Roberts, Dean of Students and Associate Professor of Homiletics, has just completed two terms of two years each in the important position of Executive Secretary of the American Association of Theological Schools. He will be succeeded by Dr. Gould Wickey, General Secretary, Council of Church Boards of Education, Washington, D.C.

During his four years of office Dr. Roberts rendered most outstanding service to the cause of theological education in the United States. Besides serving as chairman of the Commission on Accrediting and forming part of a commission invited by the Southern Presbyterian Church to study their denominational seminaries, Dr. Roberts played an important part in securing the deferment of pre-theological students from military service.

THE NEXT SEMINARY YEAR

The one hundred and thirty-first session of the Seminary will open on September 22 with matriculation of new students in the parlor of Hodge Hall and the drawing for the choice of rooms by entering students at 3:00 o'clock in Stuart Hall.

The Greek test for entering students will be held at 2:00 p.m. on September 21.

As stated in the annual catalogue, a student desiring to enter the Seminary must apply for admission by filing with the Dean of Students a formal application, a copy of which will be sent upon request. The application should be filed as early as may be convenient and not later than August 1, and should be accompanied by a letter of commendation from one's pastor and a transcript of all academic work completed. In order to be admitted to matriculation and enrollment as a student in the Seminary, the applicant for admission, whose application has been approved,

must present to the Dean of Students a college diploma, or other evidence of the degree received and the year when given.

A student coming from another Seminary must file with his Application for Admission blank a letter of dismissal from such Seminary, together with a full official statement of the courses already completed.

The opening address of the Seminary year will be given in Miller Chapel on

Wednesday, September 23, at 11:00 o'clock, and lectures and recitations will begin the same day.

STUDENT AUTHOR

We call attention with pleasure to the publication of a book by a member of the Middle Class, Donald M. Fletcher. "Gates of Brass" is a narrative poem on the passion and triumph of the Son of God. It is a graphic and moving presentation.

THE CLASS OF 1942

The plans of the members of the Class of 1942 are as follows:

Clyde M. Allison, pastor, Stanley, N.D. (National Missions)

Frederick J. Allsup, pastor, First Church, Chester, N.Y.

Irvin W. Batdorf, pastor, Hope Evangelical Church, Matamoras, Pa.

P. Arthur Brindisi, pastor, First Church, Belvidere, N.J.

Robert H. Carley, Navy Chaplain.

James R. Carroll, pastor, Chestnut Level Church, Quarryville, Pa.

Arnold B. Come, pastor, Robert Graham Memorial Church, Philadelphia, Pa.

Samuel D. Crothers, Navy Chaplain.

Varre A. Cummins, application for Navy chaplaincy pending.

Howard L. Davies, pastor, Pine Grove Church, Sunnyburn, Pa.

Roland G. deVries, pastor, Hot Springs, Mont. (National Missions)

Ernest C. Enslin, pastor, White Haven, Pa.

William L. Everhart, pastor, Darnestown Church, Gaithersburg, Md.

Floyd W. Ewalt, assistant pastor, Old Stone Church, Cleveland, Ohio.

William H. Felmeth, Artillery officer, U.S. Army.

Paul R. Fisk, application as foreign missionary pending.

Chester A. Galloway, pastor, Avenel, N.J.

James E. Goff, Navy Chaplain.

William V. S. Grosvenor, pastor, Nicholson and New Milford, Pa.

Richard C. Halverson, Young People's Evangelist, Schenectady, N.Y.

P. Robb Harvey, Army Air Corps Reserve.

Arthur C. Haverly, pastor, Fairton, N.J.

Alvin B. Henry, pastor, Willow Grove, Pa.

J. Curtis Hodgens, pastor, Plainsboro, N.J.

John F. Jansen, further study.

William R. Johnston, pastor, Elizabeth, Pa.

Edward J. Jurji, Princeton Seminary Faculty.

Russell M. Kerr, pastor, Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church.

Lee V. Kliever, pastor, Palisades, N.J., and further study.

William G. Kuhen, pastor, Harmony Church, Phillipsburg, N.J.

J. Taylor McHendry, pastor, Coal Brook Church, Neffs, Ohio.

Roger B. McShane, assistant pastor, Bethlehem Church, Philadelphia, Pa.

- Hugh M. Miller, pastor, Roslyn Church, Philadelphia, Pa.
Samuel H. Moffett, further study.
James F. Moore, pastor, First Church, College Place, Washington. (National Missions)
Edward H. Morgan, assistant pastor, Summit Church, Germantown, Pa.
F. Bruce Morgan, Jr., Brush Creek Parish, Ridgeview, W.Va. (National Missions)
Andrew E. Murray, further study.
Harlan H. Naylor, pastor, First Church, Rich Hill, Mo.
W. Burney Overton, pastor, Union Church, Blasdell, N.Y.
John Pott, pastor, Deerfield Street Church, Deerfield, N.J.
Frederick S. Price, Jr., pastor, Ocean City, Md.
Charles P. Robshaw, pastor, Dayton, N.J.
Edward L. Schalk, pastor, Community Church, Lakewood, Ohio.
Herman R. Schuessler, assistant pastor, Central Church, St. Louis, Mo.
John W. Shearer, assistant pastor, First Church, Hollywood, Calif.
Roy M. Shoaf, Pastor, First Church, Pocomoke City, Md.
William G. Silbert, Jr., pastor, Calvary Church, Newark, N.J.
Arthur B. Smith, pastor in Missouri.
Richard L. Smith, pastor, First Church, Manchester, N.H.
Simon Talman, pastor, First Church, Wildwood, N.J.
Herbert F. Thomson, further study.
Bruce G. Tucker, pastor, Central Church, Stamford, Tex.
Ansley G. Van Dyke, pastor, Toms River, N.J.
Gustavus Warfield, pastor, Cooperstown, N.Y.
Edwin R. Weidler, further study.
Robert A. D. Whitesides, pastor, Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church.
Frank H. E. Wood, assistant pastor, First Church, Ardmore, Pa.
David B. Woodward, assistant pastor, First Church, Roselle, N.J.
George H. Yount, assistant pastor, Covenant-First Church, Washington, D.C.

ALUMNI NOTES

[1892]

On May 31 The Rev. Matthew J. Hyndman, D.D., of Philadelphia, Pa., observed the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination to the Gospel ministry.

[1893]

The Rev. W. F. Dickens-Lewis has closed his year's ministry at the Prospect Street Church, Ashtabula, Ohio.

[1898]

On April 30 The Rev. Donald MacColl, D.D., closed his work at the Prospect Heights Church, Brooklyn, N.Y.

The Rev. Charles R. Nisbet, D.D., has retired from the pastorate of the Caldwell Memorial Church, Charlotte, N.C.

[1899]

On April 30 The Rev. Robert B. Beattie, D.D., retired from the pastorate of the First Church, East Orange, N.J.

Holy Trinity Church, Philadelphia, Pa., celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of the pastorate of The Rev. William Barnes Lower, D.D., from May 31 to June 7.

[1901]

The Rev. Norman L. Euwer, D.D., closed his work at the Second Church, St. Louis, Mo., on Feb. 28.

On Feb. 15 The Rev. Martin Hyink closed his pastorate at the First Church, Castlewood, and the First Holland Church, Bemis, S.D.

[1902]

The Rev. Dr. Shokichi Hata, pastor of the Japanese Church of Stockton, Calif., has accompanied his congregation to an evacuation camp.

[1903]

At its meeting in Milwaukee, Wis., in May, the 154th General Assembly elected as Moderator The Rev. Stuart Nye Hutchison, D.D., of Pittsburgh, Pa.

The Rev. Gibson Wilson has been appointed interim pastor of the Ottawa Church, Ohio.

On March 31 The Rev. James Wray closed his work at the First Church of Conrad, Iowa.

[1904]

A special service was held on March 15 at the Morrisania Church, New York City, in recognition of the thirty-fifth anniversary of the installation of the pastor, The Rev. Dr. Matthew F. Johnston.

[1905]

During the last week of February The Rev. R. A. Rinker and his congregation observed the one hundredth anniversary of the First Church of Pittston, Pa.

The Rev. Joseph L. Weisley of Forty Fort, Pa., received the degree of Doctor of Divinity from Muhlenberg College.

[1906]

The Rev. James W. Bean, D.D., is now serving as pastor of the First Church, Newton, Ohio.

[1907]

The call to the Laurel Hill Church, Pa., has been accepted by The Rev. William S. Bingham.

The Rev. John W. Dunning, D.D., has resigned as President of Alma College.

On April 5 The Rev. Arthur R. Eckels closed his pastorate of the Miller Memorial Church, Monmouth Junction, and the Plainsboro Church, N.J.

The Rev. J. Marshall Linton, pastor of the Disston Memorial Church, Philadelphia, Pa., recently celebrated the twenty-seventh anniversary of his pastorate.

The Rev. James L. McBride has entered upon his duties as pastor of the church at Point Loma, Calif.

[1908]

The degree of Doctor of Laws was conferred upon The Rev. Dr. J. S. Armentrout by Waynesburg College on May 29.

[1909]

After a pastorate of eighteen years, The Rev. Robert A. Cameron has resigned from the First Church of Aberdeen, Wash.

On April 28 The Rev. Jesse Halsey, D.D., was inaugurated as Professor of Pastoral Theology in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of Chicago.

[1910]

The Rev. J. Ross Stonesifer closed his pastorate at the First Church, Stroudsburg, Pa., on Feb. 1.

[1913]

The resignation of The Rev. R. L. Ofield from the pastorate of the church at St. Clair, Ohio, will become effective on Jan. 3, 1943.

[1914]

The Rev. Samuel R. Braden has accepted the call extended to him by the First Church of Shawnee, Okla.

The Rev. Allan H. Brown, of the Prospect Church, Ashtabula, Ohio, is now serving as a chaplain in the United States Army.

[1915]

The resignation of The Rev. S. Wilmer Beitler, D.D., from the pastorate of the First Church, Butler, Pa., became effective on July 1.

The Rev. Roy Smith has accepted a call to the Mary Martin Memorial Church, R.F.D., Coeburn, Va.

[1916]

The Rev. Dr. Archibald Campbell is now serving as associate pastor of the Knoxville Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.

On May 12 The Rev. Samuel R. Diehl, D.D., pastor of the First Church of Martinsburg, W.Va., delivered the Commencement Address at Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va.

[1917]

The Rev. David B. VanDyck has become pastor of the First Church, Grenloch, N.J.

[1919]

The Rev. Ralph B. Nesbitt has been named Associate Pastor of the Fifth Avenue Church, New York City.

[1920]

The church at Woodbridge, N.J., has granted a leave of absence to The Rev. Earl H. Devanny, in order that he may enter the air service of the country.

On March 15 The Rev. C. Ellsworth Wilson became pastor of the Lake Forest Park Church, Seattle, Wash.

[1923]

On March 1 The Rev. Dr. Ralph W. Key was installed as co-pastor of the Rutgers Church, New York City.

The Rev. Leo C. Lake has become stated supply of the Mesa Church, Colo.

[1924]

The Rev. Wallace T. McAfee has entered upon his duties as pastor of the Normal Park Church, Chicago, Ill.

On February 1 The Rev. Harvey H. McClellan conducted his last service at the United Presbyterian Church of Bovina, N.Y., before becoming a chaplain in the navy.

The Rev. William Kyle Smith, secretary of the University of Virginia Christian Association and instructor in the school of religion, has been granted a year's leave of absence, during which he will act as assistant dean and tutor at St. John's College, Annapolis, Md.

[1925]

The Rev. Arthur L. Miller has accepted a call to the First Church, Lincoln, Kans.

The one hundred twenty-fifth anniversary of the church at Gouverneur, N.Y., was recently celebrated by The Rev. Joseph A. Schofield, Jr., and his congregation.

[1926]

The Rev. Marshall B. Dendy has accepted the call extended to him by the First Church, Orlando, Fla.

The Rev. Alexander Gray has been installed as pastor of the church at Gainesville, Tex.

The two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Old Tennent Church, Tennent, N.J., was celebrated in June by The Rev. Charles H. Neff and his congregation.

On March 1 The Rev. William Wylie Young assumed his duties as pastor of the First Church, Batavia, N.Y.

[1927]

The Rev. Karl P. Buswell is now serving as a chaplain in the United States Naval Reserve.

The call to the Central Church of Buffalo, N.Y., has been accepted by The Rev. James W. Laurie, D.D.

[1928]

The Rev. R. Clifton Dorn has become pastor of the Palmdale and Little Rock Churches, Calif.

While continuing to serve the First Church of Parker, S.D., The Rev. Roy E. Jones closed his work at Harmony Church, Hurley, S.D., on April 1.

The Rev. D. Howard Keiper has accepted a call to the Middle River Church of the Brethren, Grottoes, Va.

The Rev. Francis Kinsler is now serving as pastor of the First Church, East Hampton, N.Y.

On Feb. 2 The Rev. E. E. Paulson entered upon his duties as a chaplain in the United States Army.

[1929]

The Rev. Joseph R. Harris assumed the pastorate of the First Church of Waynesburg, Pa., on April 1.

On March 5 The Rev. Lowell C. Hine opened his pastorate in the church at Chaumont, N.Y.

[1930]

The Rev. James McClure Barnett has accepted a call to the First Church of Grove City, Pa.

The church at Pitman, N.J., has released The Rev. Eben Cobb Brink from his pastorate in order that he may become an army chaplain.

[1931]

The Rev. Wilbur M. Franklin, D.D., is now serving as pastor of the First Church, St. Clairsville, Ohio.

On March 1 The Rev. Clyde D. Wickard assumed his duties as pastor of the First Church, Turtle Creek, Pa.

[1932]

The Rev. Albert W. Lenz has become pastor of the First Church, Cape May, N.J.

The pastorate of The Rev. Arsham G. Yeramian in the First Armenian Church of Fresno, Calif., was opened on Feb. 1.

[1933]

The Rev. Frederic G. Appleton is now serving as director of religious education in the Glendale Church, Calif.

The one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Lycoming Church, Williamsport, Pa., was recently celebrated by The Rev. J. Clyde Foose and his congregation.

The call to the Lawndale Church, Philadelphia, Pa., has been accepted by The Rev. William A. Guenther, Jr., and his installation took place on June 4.

[1934]

On March 1 The Rev. Walter J. Lindemann entered upon his duties as pastor of the Odell Avenue Church, Marshall, Mo.

[1935]

The Rev. Barnett S. Eby has accepted the call extended to him by the St. Paul Church, Philadelphia, Pa.

[1936]

The Rev. Joseph Blackburn is now pastor of the Ada and Dala Churches, Ohio.

The Rev. Frederick W. Brink has accepted the position of Presbyterian student pastor at Ithaca, N.Y., on the campuses of Cornell University and Ithaca College.

The call to the pastorate of the Brentwood Heights Church, Los Angeles, Calif., has been accepted by The Rev. Edwin Cowan.

On March 16 The Rev. L. David Cowie became pastor of the Linwood Church, Kansas City, Mo.

[1937]

The Rev. G. Raymond Campbell has accepted a call to the church at Bartlesville, Okla.

On Feb. 24 The Rev. W. David Glenn entered upon the pastorate of the Bennett Church, Luzerne, Pa.

The installation of The Rev. Dezso Parragh as pastor of the Magyar Church, Elizabeth, N.J., took place on June 17.

The Rev. James K. Story closed his work at First Church, Plainview, Tex., on March 31.

The Rev. William G. Vincent, of the Elderton and Whitesburg Churches, and Curry Run Church, Indiana, Pa., is now in the service of the United States Army.

On May 1 The Rev. Thomas W. Wilbanks assumed the pastorate of the Fourth Church, Louisville, Ky.

[1938]

The degree of Doctor of Theology was conferred upon The Rev. Adolph Behrenberg, of Iselin, N.J., by Union Seminary, N.Y.

The Rev. Pancras C. Curt became pastor of the First Churches of Annapolis and Ironton, Mo., on March 16.

On Feb. 1 The Rev. Vernon P. Martin, Jr., entered upon the pastorate of the Evanston Church, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Rev. Robert W. Rayburn has accepted a call to the South Charleston Church, Ohio.

The South Church of Montclair, N.J., has granted a leave of absence to The Rev. F. Lawson Suetterlein, who has been appointed a chaplain in the United States Army.

The degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Classics was conferred upon The Rev. Bruce M. Metzger of the Faculty of the Seminary by Princeton University.

[1939]

On March 28 The Rev. A. Paul Lam, of the First Church, Belvidere, N.J., became a chaplain in the United States Army.

The call to the Brookville Church, Pa., has been accepted by The Rev. William F. MacCalmont.

The First Church, Dolgeville, N.Y., has granted a leave of absence to The Rev. S. John Wylie, Jr., in order that he may become a chaplain in the United States Army.

The degree of Doctor of Philosophy was conferred by Princeton University upon Samuel S. Haas, of Edgewater N.J., and upon Robert H. Boyd, of St. Paul, Minnesota.

[1940]

The Rev. William H. Heilman has accepted a call to the Pleasant Grove and Schooley's Mountain Churches, N.J.

The Rev. Keith B. Munro is now serving as a line officer in the United States Army.

On Jan. 1 The Rev. Kenneth E. Nelson entered upon the pastorate of the Oxnard Church, Calif.

The Rev. Salvatore C. Shangler closed his work at the Immanuel Church, Trenton, N.J., on May 1.

On May 1 The Rev. Samuel G. Warr became pastor of the First Church, New Philadelphia, Ohio.

[1941]

The Rev. John N. Montgomery is now serving as pastor of the Community Church, Clewiston, Del.

The Board of Foreign Missions has appointed The Rev. Richard Shaul a missionary to Colombia.

The pastorate of the First Church, Margaretville, N.Y., has been assumed by The Rev. Charles T. Theal.

BOOK REVIEWS

Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, by WILLIAM FOXWELL ALBRIGHT. The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1942, pp. xii + 238. \$2.25.

As in the case of *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (1940), this book reflects the range of Professor Albright's encyclopaedic scholarship: Semitic languages, archaeology, ancient history, Old Testament science, the history of religions, philosophy, and psychology. In the first chapter he refers to the excellency of palaeolithic art, which may be compared to the *élan* of youth. He shows a high appreciation of Phoenician art and of Old Testament literature. He observes that the emotional and spiritual experiences of the prophets have proved normative for two and a half millennia of Judaeo-Christian religious life. The author repeats his etymology of *nābī* (prophet) as "one who is called (by God)." The older explanation as one who speaks forth what he has received from God, the spokesman or mouthpiece of God, however, has support in Exodus 7:1f., where the word is used in the sense of an intermediary. In view of this passage, the reviewer is not convinced of the new etymology, attractive as it may appear. A quotation from Chapter I will show the value of the book: "In fundamental ethical and spiritual matters we have not progressed at all beyond the empirico-logical world of the O.T. or the unrivalled combination of pre-logical intuition, empirico-logical wisdom and logical deduction which we find in the N.T. In fact a very large section of modern religion, literature and art actually represents a profound retrogression when compared with the O.T."

Chapter II, the Archaeological Background of O.T. Religion, is a mine of information in

which are discussed Syria and Palestine, Mesopotamia, Egypt, the Hittites, Arabia, Cyprus, and the Aegean. Here he uses archaeology in its inclusive sense, covering all written and unwritten materials from the ancient Near East. In Chapter III we find a clear, though brief, presentation of the religion of the Canaanites; it is based upon the latest information and illuminates the Old Testament references to Baal and other heathen divinities. Chapters IV and V deal with archaeology and the religion of early and later Israel. The author makes the important point that religious practice is seldom intelligible without adequate understanding of social, economic, and political history. Both chapters are clear, and the thought moves rapidly.

Albright maintains that the cosmic monotheism of Solomon's Temple makes Mosaic monotheism a *sine qua non* for the comprehension of early Israelitish religious history and that from first to last ethical monotheism remained the heart of Israelite religion from the primitive simplicity of the Judges to the high cultural level of the fifth century B.C. He says: "There can be no doubt that archaeology has confirmed the substantial historicity of O.T. tradition." The religion of the Old Testament and Christianity are historical religions, and Albright has shown how archaeology checks all extreme views concerning the meaning and content of Biblical tradition.

This is indeed a remarkable book, and in addition the amount of information in the notes in the way of bibliography and interpretation is amazing. Ministers and professors of religion and Biblical literature should not only read this work, but also study it and use it frequently for reference.

HENRY S. GEHMAN

Horus, Royal God of Egypt, by SAMUEL A. B. MERCER. Society of Oriental Research, Grafton, Mass., 1942. 8vo., xx + 231 pp. \$3.80.

It is not possible to review this book in detail in a journal of this nature, but it should be called to the attention of ministers who are interested in ancient history and the history of religions. Mercer calls Horus one of Egypt's greatest mental creations.

The first three chapters very appropriately deal with backgrounds in terms of archaeological research, of civilizations, and of political and religious reconstruction respectively. In succeeding chapters are discussed the name, family, titles, and symbols of Horus, Horus gods, gods identified with Horus, places where Horus was worshipped, and representations of this god. Chapter VII is devoted to the fascinating subject of the Eye of Horus; in Chapter X are discussed the theology and worship of Horus. This divinity is derived ultimately from Mesopotamia, whence he passed to Arabia, thence to Egypt by the Wadi Hammamat; finally he made his way to the Delta. With the unification of Egypt he became the king-god, the Royal god. The appendix contains a list of epithets of Horus and also personal names in which the name of this god appears. Dr. Mercer has succeeded in presenting an intricate subject in simple and interesting fashion and placing it within the reach of one who is not a specialist in Egyptology.

HENRY S. GEHMAN

Documents of the Primitive Church, by CHARLES CUTLER TORREY. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1941. pp. xviii + 309. \$3.50.

While a student of Professor J. A. Montgomery at the University of Pennsylvania, the reviewer took for one year a seminar in the Aramaic Gospels, and as a result of the interest aroused at that time, he has been giving for a number of years a similar course at Princeton. Professor Torrey has given the theory of the Aramaic origin of the Gospels an extensive and convincing presentation in his two books, *The Four Gospels—a New Translation* (1933) and *Our Translated Gospels* (1936). The reviewer heartily recommends these books to the minister and Biblical student on account of the clear light they shed on many difficult passages. It is evident that the New Testament in its religion and psychology is a Semitic, not a Hellenistic

book. In 1937 Professor E. J. Goodspeed in his *New Chapters in New Testament Study* absurdly quotes a "lady from Philadelphia" (p. 163): "Dr. Gehman, Professor of Old Testament at Princeton, says that he is sure that the New Testament was written in Aramaic and that as soon as he translates the Greek into Aramaic all the difficulties are smoothed out." That certainly is a sweeping statement, implying that the *whole* New Testament was originally written in Aramaic. Needless to say, the reviewer never made such a foolish assertion, and upon inquiry, the Chicago savant did not know who the lady was and could not furnish her name.

Professor Torrey is an accomplished Semitist, and in Aramaic he has no superior. Whether Biblical scholars are willing to accept his theory *in toto* or not, they will have to give it respectful and serious consideration. In this book the author continues to hold his view that all four Gospels, in all their parts (excepting Luke's prologue and John 21) are rendered into Greek from Aramaic. The purpose of the Gospels was to show that Jesus of Nazareth is the long-expected Messiah. The language of Palestine in Jesus' day was Aramaic, and Torrey does not believe that the Jewish people would have waited from forty to eighty years for the account that Jesus is the Messiah. Probably by the end of the first century the language of the Church was definitely and finally Greek. Mark is dated A.D. 40, and according to Torrey, was quoted by St. Paul. Matthew is put after Mark, hardly later than A.D. 50. The author maintains as absolutely certain that the Jews of Palestine in the first century had in their hands certain Semitic writings which they called "the gospels" and regarded as the authoritative Christian scriptures. The title of Chapter III is "Aramaic Gospels in the Synagogue." From evidence in the Talmud he concludes that Mark and Matthew were known to the Jews of Palestine in the third quarter of the first century.

In Chapter II are discussed the Biblical Quotations in Matthew. Chapter IV is devoted to the origin of the "Western" text. The longest chapter in the book is the fifth, which deals with the language and date of the Apocalypse. This book was originally composed in Aramaic and is assigned to A.D. 68.

Professor Torrey's translation of the Gospels and his reconstruction of the Aramaic original are not subjective, but are based upon sound philological principles. A particular merit of his view is that it projects the written sources of the Gospels to a period very close to the

time of our Lord and thus supports the impression of authenticity and by inference the trustworthiness of the records.

Even though a minister never studied Aramaic and knows that his small Greek and less Hebrew are rusty, he can get a great deal out of this excellent book and should not be discouraged from attempting to read this stimulating volume. One thing remains clear: an authoritative interpretation of the Bible demands a working knowledge of the original languages of Scripture.

HENRY S. GEHMAN

The Literary Lineage of the King James Bible 1340-1611, by CHARLES C. BUTTERWORTH. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1941. pp. xi + 394. \$3.50.

This is another worthy contribution in the long line of books dealing with the text and transmission of the English Bible. As the title indicates, the author limits his careful researches in three ways. First, he deals mainly with the literary development of the English Bible, showing what contributions were made in style and syntax in the various translations. These numerous translations are of course discussed in their historical setting, but the historical details play a secondary role throughout the book. In fact their recital is generally so prosaic that much of the "romance" of the Bible's history is lost. Secondly, the author's terminus ad quem is the King James Bible of 1611. This is a logical boundary to be sure, but it is hoped that a work dealing with the modern translations and revisions in the same careful way may soon follow. Thirdly, only the English versions are treated here. This is the weakest part of the book, for nowhere does the author discuss the accuracy and faithfulness of the translations in relation to the original languages. As he himself says, "We shall have but little to say of the literary values and effects of those older languages—Hebrew, Syriac, or Greek—in which the Scriptures were originally set down" (p. 4). By Syriac he probably means Aramaic.

Not only are the eleven chapters of the book, dealing with the history of the English Bible, replete with examples to show what each tributary version brought to the enrichment of the Authorized Version, but two appendices are added to show in graphic form the "actual development of the Scriptural style as it took place" (p. vi, App. I), and to show "how the lineage of the King James version varies for different portions of the Bible" (p. vi, App. II).

These appendices are in some respects the most important part of the whole work, for here, in the scope of a few pages, the results of the author's labors are succinctly and convincingly presented. A third appendix contains a bibliography of manuscript verses, printed verses, and history of the English Bible.

The book is the result of careful, arduous work, offering several new contributions of importance to the expert in this field. It is truly another milestone in the study of the greatest Book in the world.

CHARLES T. FRITSCH

The Prophets and their Times, by J. M. POWIS SMITH. Second Edition revised by WILLIAM A. IRWIN. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1941. pp. xvii + 342. \$2.50.

No one can understand the prophets apart from a knowledge of the times in which they lived. It was with this in mind that the author of the first edition of this book set about to write the story of the prophets, not, as he says, "to preach the message of the prophets to the men of to-day," but rather "to show as clearly as possible what the prophets were trying to do and say in their own generation" (p. v).

Prof. Irwin of the University of Chicago has undertaken to revise this work because of the considerable progress made in Old Testament studies since its publication. The bibliographical material has been brought up to date (cf. pp. 13, 36, 198), and in regard to certain problems, the reviser has introduced his own views, which are quite at variance with those expressed by his predecessor. In the main, however, little change has been made.

There are three important points of difference between the two editions which are worthy of consideration. In the first place, Prof. Irwin regards the prophets as "mystics rather than ecstasies" (p. 14). In this change of viewpoint from that expressed in the first edition (p. 11) he claims that "he is not so much alone," and he quotes a considerable bibliography which, he says, "will serve to indicate what to my mind is a growing conviction among Old Testament scholars" (p. x). Yet Prof. Albright, whose work *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (1940), is quoted in this bibliography, says that the prophetic phenomenon is not "mystical but pathological" (p. 231), and he recognizes the ecstatic nature of Ezekiel's visions. To say with Prof. Irwin that "the psychology of the

canonical prophets was a normal religious psychology" (p. 14) does not explain the "phenomenon" by any means.

Secondly, he interprets the Hosea story (pp. 79 ff.) and Isaiah 53 (pp. 235 ff.) in the light of the prevalent Canaanite fertility cult (cf. H. G. May, "The Fertility Cult in Hosea," *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, XLVIII, 73-98). We cannot go into a detailed discussion of this here, but suffice it to say that in this interpretation we find a strange mixture of archaeology and history, and the result is poor history. Adonis and Hosea just don't mix!

Thirdly, Prof. Irwin, in line with the other points considered, takes the extreme view that Ezekiel "is now believed to have begun his work in Jerusalem, apparently some time before the disaster of 586 B.C." (p. 199). "Whether or not he was ever in Babylonia remains an open question" (p. 200). The Book of Ezekiel itself he believes is composed of material gathered throughout the last five centuries B.C. (p. 215). Instead of making Ezekiel the "Father of Judaism," as most scholars do, he says that the Book of Ezekiel is the "child of Judaism." Thus the ecstatic, prophetic elements are eliminated from the book. It is indeed hard to reconcile this theory with the facts of archaeology and history, and the prophetic psychology which the Bible presents.

CHARLES T. FRITSCH

The Fourth Gospel. Its Significance and Environment, by R. H. STRACHAN, D.D., Professor of New Testament Language and Literature, Westminster College, Cambridge (England). Third Edition, revised and rewritten. Student Christian Movement Press, London, 1941. pp. x + 345.

Dr. Strachan's commentary on St. John's Gospel is one of the most popular among the S.C.M. Press Commentaries, and this new edition will certainly win the work many new friends. In an Introduction of ninety-six pages the learned author discusses with great lucidity and simplicity the principal historical problems of the Gospel, such as the portrait of Jesus, as compared with the Synoptic Gospels, the discourses, the Evangelist's conception of history, the purpose of the Gospels, the environment of the Gospel, construction and authorship, and the Logos conception in the Fourth Gospel. The author has abandoned some of his former critical views. He recognizes now the historical value of the Gospel, and while he feels unable to

acknowledge John, the son of Zebedee as the author, he regards the Gospel, nevertheless, as the work of a disciple of the Beloved Disciple. Unlike the earlier editions this third edition not only maintains the integrity of the Gospel, but also rejects the idea of dislocation of passages within the text.

Three quarters of Dr. Strachan's book are devoted to a running commentary of the Gospel on the basis of the English version, but with constant references to the Greek text. The author does not go into all minutiae of criticism, but all essential problems are adequately dealt with. Special emphasis is laid on the spiritual values of the Gospel. The great scholarship of the author is displayed in a way that makes the reader acquainted with most phases of modern research, yet never becomes merely technical. My only serious criticism of this excellent commentary would be directed against a certain vagueness concerning the nature of Jesus' miracles and resurrection. Dr. Strachan never tells us exactly what in his view actually happened, though he admits that for the Evangelist all the events narrated were actually significant in themselves (p. 35). But the author seems sometimes to think that their symbolic meaning could be true apart from their historicity.

OTTO A. PIPER

A History of Early Christian Literature, by EDGAR J. GOODSPEED. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1942. pp. 324. \$2.50.

The reader who is accustomed to associate the name Goodspeed with research in the New Testament field may wonder at first thought whether the present book represents a venture into a new and unfamiliar bailiwick. But, as a matter of fact, during his nearly forty years of service at the University of Chicago, not only Biblical but Patristic Greek as well received his special attention, and most of the positions taken in this book were worked out, so he discloses, with groups of graduate students of early Christian literature. This volume, therefore, complements very closely his earlier books dealing with New Testament introduction.

Although "the author and finisher of our faith" left no written documents, not a few who espoused His cause in the immediately succeeding centuries were prolific writers. A great part of what they committed to writing has perished, but there is still extant such a

mass of diverse *genres* of literature as to be embarrassing to the historian who wishes to articulate all these into a well-written and coherent treatise. Professor Goodspeed chooses to utilize two schemes of arrangement. He groups the earlier literature (down to about the last quarter of the second century) into several categories, such as letters, revelations, gospels, acts, manuals, hymns, and so on, with the individual items arranged chronologically within each of these divisions. But for the later period, after the Old Catholic Church emerged and when diligent writers, such as Origen, produced many types of literature, the author collects his material around major personalities. Thus he not only avoids the necessity of dealing with the same Father several times, but he also can describe the work of each of these many-sided individuals as a unit in relation to his times and problems. Following such a plan Professor Goodspeed has produced a book crowded with information which is at the same time well organized. The volume covers the first three centuries of the Christian Church, going down to, but unfortunately not including, Eusebius.

Very seldom does Professor Goodspeed need to express judgments of value in the realm of doctrine. The tendency (observable in his *American Translation of the New Testament*) to favor an anemic theology is almost wholly absent here. In historical and critical fields, however, the author expresses himself in accord with what one would expect in the light of his previous publications. Whenever it is possible, for example, he discounts the evidence for the existence and circulation of Aramaic documents in the early Church. Significantly, the word "Aramaic" does not appear in the index of his book. He likewise repeats his formerly published hypotheses—always ingenious and sometimes plausible—regarding the influence of the publication of various groups of canonical books upon the immediately succeeding non-canonical literature.

To compare this with other books available for the English reader, one can say that it is more up-to-date than Crutwell's two volumes, more readable than Krueger's solid work, less extensive than Tixeront's detailed treatment, and better documented than Bardy's slender volumes. In a word, Professor Goodspeed has provided a serviceable book which may be read with pleasure and profit.

BRUCE M. METZGER

The Passing of the Saint, A Study of a Cultural Type, by JOHN M. MECKLIN. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1941. pp. ix + 206. \$2.00.

This is an instructive and engaging monograph on one of the distinctive products of medieval piety—the canonical saint. After sketching the background of the Primitive Church, the author emphasizes three factors of special significance in the making of the saint: "the spiritual and moral dynamic" that was "provided by the Pauline-Augustinian tradition"—the "Christian Myth" is his favorite designation for historic Christianity; the folklore colored by crass superstitions and heathenish practices; and the magical sacramentarianism of the secularized Church. The naive supernaturalism that gave the saint his keen sense of being a citizen of heaven is reflected in many a bizarre legend showing the superiority of spiritual over physical forces.

Specially suggestive is the chapter on "The Saint and Society," in which several illustrations are given of Harnack's statement in his celebrated essay on *Monasticism*: "It is one of the most striking historical facts that the church, precisely at the moment when she was becoming more and more a legal and sacramentarian institution, threw out an ideal of life which could be realized not in herself but only alongside of herself." The author himself states the paradox even more pointedly: "The saintly ideal demands aloofness from the world and its utter renunciation and condemnation, and yet any social justification for the saint implies his essential spiritual solidarity with the world."

A chapter on "Augustine and the Cosmos" offers some admirable comments on Augustine's *Confessions* "as the final statement of saintly piety" and on *The City of God* as "a philosophy of history which objectifies the logical implications of the intimate experiences between the soul and God." But few students of Augustine, we feel convinced, will endorse the overdrawn antithesis, "He thought like a Platonist, felt like a Christian, and acted like a pragmatist"; or the equally one-sided judgment, "feeling is, for Augustine, the ultimate source of knowledge." Both statements fail to do justice to the cognitive element both in Augustine's personal faith, hope, and love, and in his theological treatment of these Christian graces.

The two chapters on Bernard of Clairvaux and the one on Francis of Assisi give us medieval sainthood at its best. These worthies are ably interpreted, with a firm seizure of the attractive

as well as the occasionally repellent saliences of the story.

The author concludes with brief discussions of the causes that led to "the passing" of the saint—the chief emphasis falls on the rise of the modern middle class in the wake of the Renaissance and the Reformation—and the possibility of developing a new type of sainthood under the conditions of "the great Democratic Myth" which, as "the rationalization of the needs and ambitions of the middle class," has "dominated the English-speaking world for two centuries." These pages, too, abound in observations that reveal keen psychological insights and wide acquaintance with political theories. But here as throughout the work the author betrays a marked bias against the Pauline, Augustinian-Calvinistic tradition. Baxter's "saint," e.g., is described as "a pale, theological abstraction, the creature of three dogmatic fictions—predestination, redemption, and sanctification." This hardly accords with the subsequent representation that Baxter makes much of the economic virtues—thrift, diligence, redeeming the time, and the like—so that "accumulation of wealth" and "assurance of saintliness thus go hand in hand."

The Epilogue ventures the prediction: "The great democratic community of the future will not be a political or economic artifact but an organic growth embodying socialized religious loyalties that beget sympathetic insight and tolerance." The prophecy would no doubt inspire more confidence in some readers if the "loyalties" were distinctively "Christian" and not merely and vaguely "religious."

FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER

Christian Attitude Towards the Emperor in the Fourth Century, Especially as Shown in Addresses to the Emperor, by KENNETH M. SETTON, PH.D., Instructor in Classics and Ancient History in Boston University. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941. pp. 239. \$2.75.

The earthly history of the kingdom of God may, and indeed to a large extent must, be written in terms of the relation of Church and State, the *sacerdotium* and the *imperium*, or—to use the more distinctive designations now current in discussions of the Ecumenical Movement—the *Corpus Christi* and the *Corpus Christianum*.

The volume before us deals with one of the most important phases of this age-old problem—

the attempted solutions made during the notable fourth century that opened with the triumph of Constantine over paganism and with his assumption of virtually supreme power over ecclesiastical as well as civil affairs, and closed with the humiliation of Theodosius by Ambrose in the West and the equally audacious defiance of Eudoxia by Chrysostom in the East. The author has explored the primary sources with great thoroughness and presented his findings in a systematic and impressive fashion. But like most doctoral dissertations, this highly specialized study is not meant for the general reader. The numerous and often lengthy footnotes and the many Greek and Latin quotations dispersed in parentheses in the body of the text give the book a rather forbidding aspect. Happily, now and then, especially in connection with the testimony of such outstanding leaders as Eusebius of Caesarea, Firmicus, Athanasius, Synesius, and Chrysostom, some engaging biographical details are furnished; but one wishes that such material had been considerably increased: it would have helped to clarify some of the obscure references and it would have added to the attractiveness of the narrative.

Of special interest are two chapters devoted to topics lying somewhat beyond the scope of the main investigation. In the Introduction there is a brief but discriminating survey of the New Testament data and then of the pre-Constantinian views, both pagan and Christian, concerning the imperial authority. The concluding discussion sets forth the Christian and the pagan conceptions concerning the honor to be paid to images of the emperors. As the author concedes, one may question whether the theoretical distinction, often made by the Fathers, between the adoration and the worship of the imperial effigies had any more practical significance for those inside of the Church than for those outside.

Taken as a whole, the work offers nothing that necessitates any important change in the statements to be found in most of the standard church histories; but while there are no novelties, there is much valuable material, which the good Indices make readily available for any desiring information concerning the beginnings in the fourth century of that struggle between Church and State that has so largely molded European culture ever since. Augustine's *City of God*, with its wealth of teaching on the theme in question, was purposely, for economy of treatment, left out of the survey. One may approve the reason for the omission, but not the further intimation that an adequate dis-

cussion of this monumental apology would contribute "little if anything." After all, it is Augustine rather than any of his predecessors, that embodies the Christian legacy of the Graeco-Roman world in the form that made the *sacerdotium* and the *imperium* of the next millennium find in him their chief protagonist.

FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER

The Social Message of the Apostle Paul, by HOLMES ROLSTON, Richmond, Virginia, John Knox Press, 1942. pp. 250. \$2.00.

The author of this book is one of the most scholarly ministers of the younger generation in American Presbyterianism. A number of years ago he wrote a book entitled "A Conservative Looks At Barth And Brunner," in which he set forth in a sympathetic, yet critical way, the great religious and theological significance for our time of the "Crisis Theology." In this new book, which consists of the Sprunt Lectures for 1942, Dr. Rolston, while maintaining his own theological independence, manifests his deep indebtedness to the dialectical theologians.

In undertaking to expound with deep approval the social teaching of St. Paul as the thinker who exercised the most decisive influence upon the social attitudes of the early Christian Church, the author has already drawn upon himself the ire of a number of reviewers. It is amazing how wedded Christian thinkers in this country continue to be to the idea that Paul was the great perverter of Christianity, instead of its most luminous interpreter and its most dynamic promoter. Dr. Rolston, however, maintains that it is only when the radical and conservative principles in Paul are understood and applied that social change can be revolutionary in a Christian sense.

On the one hand, Paul set forth truth so radical in character that it took direct issue with the spirit and substance of the old order; on the other hand, he never made the mistake of demanding the expression of an absolute social ethic in a concrete historical situation. For, remarks our author, "the radical demand of an absolute ethic in the midst of a sinful situation may be a sinful demand."

Dr. Rolston opens ground upon a most important question which must increasingly engage the thought of all who agonize with the problem of organizing social life in accordance with Christian principles.

JOHN A. MACKAY

On This Foundation: The Evangelical Witness in Latin America, by W. STANLEY RYCROFT, New York, Friendship Press, 1942. pp. 210. Paper 60c, Cloth \$1.00.

This book is the new mission study text book for 1942-43. Its appearance is most opportune, coming as it does upon the wave crest of a great new interest in Latin American lands. Its value is inestimable for ministers and Christian leaders who desire to obtain a deeper insight into the Latin American situation and into the problem of Inter-American relations than can be obtained from most books on the subject.

A book in which Latin America is studied from the perspective of the Kingdom of God is a much needed addition to the growing literature, so much of it superficial, which purports to interpret the twenty republics to the south of us. It cannot be too much emphasized that no country or people can be understood until they are understood in the light of God and His purpose for mankind. International relations will never be established upon a firm basis until their foundation is a common acceptance of great spiritual truths. That being so, no book that fails to raise the ultimate question of human relationship in the Western world can be a satisfactory or permanent contribution to the essential problem of the Americas. For in international, as well as in personal life, true life consists in "knowing" God.

Many books about Latin America have been written by people who butterflied around the continent and never discovered the dimension of depth in Latin American affairs. It is consoling that the author of "On This Foundation" lived for nearly twenty years in the southern continent. His preparation for the task of writing the book must be regarded as ideal. Eighteen years of residence and work in a single, representative country, Peru, followed by visits during the next two years to nearly all the Latin American countries, gave him an understanding of Latin American character, a knowledge of Latin American institutions and literature, an understanding of the religious situation, and a first hand experience of the attitude of Latin Americans toward evangelical Christianity.

JOHN A. MACKAY

The Philippines: A Study in National Development, by JOSEPH RALSTON HAYDEN. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1942. pp. xxvi + 984. \$9.00.

As chairman of the Department of Political Science in the University of Michigan, vice-governor of the Philippine Islands (1933-35), scholar and critic of note, Professor Hayden writes his book from a great vantage ground. His intimate acquaintance with the Far East has enabled him to interpret Philippine phenomena in their relation to the broader aspects of the Orient. He gives an analysis of the twentieth-century liberation of the Philippines which might well serve as a model for similar attempts elsewhere. This work brings to the student of political theory an able summary of the cultural, social, and constitutional gains that can be won in the smaller and less developed nations through benevolent Western stewardship. The events of the last year prove beyond any doubt the soundness of the author's views in regard to Far Eastern problems and the related American foreign policy.

Named after Philip II (1556-98) of Spain, the Philippine archipelago first became known to Europeans in A.D. 1521 through Ferdinand Magellan. Chinese influence upon the islands dates back to the tenth century as the records of trading voyages testify. Far earlier, probably during the sun-rise epoch of the Christian era, Hindu relations are established. Sanskrit words embedded in the native tongues and the form of scripts encountered at the time of the Spanish discovery confirm the antiquity of contacts with India. But as late as forty-three years ago the Filipinos were the backward colonial subjects of a decadent European state. Until interrupted by the Japanese invasion of 1942, they had since become the citizens of an enlightened, intensely nationalistic commonwealth. Their government was democratic in form, modern in organization and almost free from external control.

With the possible exception of a small number of Negroid forest dwellers, the majority of Filipinos belong to the great racial group, the Malays. Among the sixteen million Christians and Moslems who dwell in the lowlands, this type is fairly uniform, although in almost every group the Malay stock has been blended with Indonesian and Mongoloid elements. The presence of Chinese and Spanish blood is apparent in the leading people of every Christian area. Greater ethnic diversity exists among the half million or more pagans. Fundamentally, the book under review depicts the rise of a new Malay Filipino nation, with its own culture, official language, and political institutions.

Among the non-Christians, the Moslems are the most impressive group. The Spaniards were the hereditary enemies of these people, for they had

had a seven-century fight in the Iberian Peninsula with the followers of the Prophet. Therefore they dubbed the Philippine Moslems "Moros," that is, Moors. Dr. N. M. Saleeby—recognized by the author as a reliable authority on the Philippines—traced the introduction of Islam into Mindanao to about A.D. 1475, from Arabia via Juhur in Malaya. The Moros, who are not savage, thus became literate in the fifteenth century. They adopted the Caliphal forms of political and constitutional government. They applied the Arabic alphabet to local dialects and translated the Koran and other standard Islamic texts into their own speech. Of special significance is the attempt of the American Government to remove the friction between the Moslems and other elements of the population. With the inauguration of the Commonwealth the Filipinization of the Moros becomes a definite national policy. What has been accomplished along this line redounds to the honor of the peace-loving nations. It engenders good will in the Middle East, seat of a worldwide Islam that extends from Morocco, on the Atlantic, to India, Malaya, and Indonesia.

That the Philippine Islands are the only Christian country in a non-Christian part of the world makes this volume invaluable to the Christian student of modern history. For nearly four hundred years, the Roman Catholic Church has played a leading role in the life of the Filipino people. It is a powerful buttress of law, order, and stability. The Philippine Independent Church—the Aglipayan Church—upholds a rationalistic, nationalistic theology. It is identified with the burning cause of nationalism but lacks in spiritual and ethical vitality. Therefore, its ability to cope with the needs of the people or to compete in the long run with the Mother Church of the Philippines is doubtful. During the past four decades the Evangelical Churches have had a remarkable growth and exercise an influence out of proportion to their numerical strength.

EDWARD J. JURJI

My India, My America, by KRISHNANAL SHRIDHARANI. Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1941, New York. pp. xv + 647. \$3.75.

If it be true that "the dominant fact in the consciousness of Europe is the will to act, in that of India the will to know," then it might be said that the book under review undertakes to show that India is now ready both to know and to act. As a spokesman, Shridharani is to India what Lin Yutang is to China. A poet and dramatist in his

own right, the author, before reaching these shores in 1934, already had to his credit a fine reputation in his native land as a Gujarati writer. Even before he studied at Visva Bharati—the famous international university of the late Rabin-dranath Tagore—in Santiniketan (the abode of peace), Dr. Shridharani had become an ardent disciple of Gandhi. Only one month before the start of World War II, he published on Gandhi and Gandhism a volume entitled *War Without Violence*. That was his first publication in America; the one under review is his second.

Throughout the centuries, the foundation of Hindu society has been laid upon the three cornerstones of the joint family, the village community, and the caste system. Regarded as divinely ordained, the last cornerstone has received the support of religious sanction. In *My India, My America*—essentially a book of wisdom and commentary, of stories, facts and insights—one acquires a clear-cut grasp of the fundamental structure of Indian society. To the student of the non-Christian world no better contemporaneous introduction to India can be recommended. Dr. Shridharani transcends the limits of the present situation in order to formulate the shape of things coming. He takes up the pattern of regional blocs that shall come into vogue, in preparation for lasting peace under a federal world organization. Each power will forego a portion of its sovereignty that it may thereby find a common ground with others. He defines India's role within the sphere of her existence as that of Hinduism mediating between the Moslem world on the West and the Buddhist on the East. He anticipates cooperation between India and China, casts doubt on Japan's prospects for success and considers the position of Russia as a neighbor.

But that is not all. Not only do we find here the first "Inside India" presentation by a Hindu; there is beyond that, composed in a different vein and incorporating a new theme, though on a somewhat lower plane, the broad perspective of America as seen by a gifted author. Many sojourners here have recorded their reflections on America, but this is the first instance in literary history that a Hindu has looked over the American scene. What he sees and reports is worth pondering, not least of all by a Christian minister.

The missionary strategist, too, will find many an eye opener in the course of this text. Gandhi's *stayagraha*—insistence on truth as a philosophy of war without violence—is dressed up as a kind of Hindu counterpart to the Christian Doctrine of Love. At the same time, the ultra-nationalist mentality, feelings of self-sufficiency, identification of the missionary with the alien overlord

and a conscientious failure to reach the depth of Christian teaching prompt the author to exclaim: "The missionary is more of a problem to the Orient than the Orient is to the missionary." The sting that produces such an attitude can of course be avoided if the words of Sir William Hunter, describing the keynote missionary policy of the Jesuits in India from the beginning, are heeded and adapted: "The Christian religion cannot be regarded as naturalized in a country until it is in a position to propagate its own priesthood." Be that as it may, in spite of much that the student of missions finds untenable in this volume, he must still be duly thankful, if only for the assistance thereby rendered by the disclosure of hitherto secreted resentment that may not judiciously be ignored.

EDWARD J. JURJI

God and Philosophy, by ÉTIENNE GILSON. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1941. pp. xviii + 147. \$2.00.

This is, in many ways, a remarkable book. It may serve as a lucid and concise introduction to the study of Neo-Thomistic philosophy and also of the main problems of the philosophy of religion. Neo-Thomism represents, within contemporary Christian thought, an attitude which contradicts all the essential motifs of the theology of Crisis, trying to establish a synthesis of God and the first philosophical principle of Being, of revelation and reason, of theology and metaphysics, of faith and speculative thought, of church and civilization. Gilson's book is a vigorous plea for a natural theology that would furnish an adequate link between the realm of revelation and the ultimate principles of secular thought and life. The reviewer shares Gilson's misgivings as to the chaotic condition of contemporary philosophy and the ensuing moral, social, political, and pedagogical chaos, and agrees with his complaint about our lack of intellectual self-discipline. The present-day catastrophe is, to a certain extent, due to the fact that modern humanity has lost its insight into fundamental principles of philosophy and theology. Even though disagreeing with the author in his conclusion, I believe that, humanly speaking, our future greatly depends on our spiritual vigor and intellectual capacity to establish a comprehensive philosophy based on biblical revelation.

The book deals with the ways in which classic schools of philosophy (Plato and Aristotle, Plotinus and St. Augustine, Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus, Descartes and Male-

branche, Spinoza and Leibniz, Kant and Comte, and some modern scientists) sought to establish harmony between the God of religion and the highest principle of metaphysics. Gilson helps us to understand why Plato failed at this point, and why Aristotle, because of his indisputably rational theology, deprived the Greeks of their religion. Greek philosophy was never able to understand the order of *existence* behind the order of essence, *e.g.*, behind the realm of rational thought. It was not until Christianity had posited the biblical reality of the "He who is" (Yahwe) as the first principle and supreme cause of all things that philosophers began to understand the real existence of God and of the created world. But in Gilson's opinion, only Thomas Aquinas adequately grasped the unity of essence and existence, of the God of faith and the first principle of thought: Thomas' idea of a pure Act of existence, *e.g.*, of an absolute, free, self-subsisting, knowing Being, is a metaphysical equivalent of the biblical reality of God. We are advised to go way back to Thomas in order to overcome the metaphysical mistakes and errors of modern philosophers and scientists.

The book is a revealing interpretation of some essential metaphysical problems. I wish, however, to conclude my review with two critical questions. Gilson has, with a certain right, stated that from the second century A.D. on, men had to use a Greek philosophical technique in order to express ideas that had entered their heads through the revelation of the Old and New Testaments. He also asserts that St. Augustine reached the synthesis of the biblical God and metaphysics on the strength of Christian faith. But at the same time he states that Thomas reached the same synthesis on the strength of straight metaphysical knowledge, this being his unique achievement, unparalleled in the history of Christian thought. It is precisely here that I raise my first question: Is a real synthesis, or unity, of essence and existence at all possible and comprehensible beyond faith in the revealed God? Gilson himself says that Thomas had "transfigured the supreme Thought of Aristotle into the Christian 'He who is', thus raising a first philosophical principle up to the level of God" (p. 85). Does this not involve the inescapable conclusion that the metaphysics of Thomas, far from being pure metaphysics, presupposed, as did St. Augustine, the revealed God of the biblical testimony?

My second question comes from another angle: Has not Thomas' natural philosophy transfigured the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the direction of Greek metaphysics to such an extent that his theology has to be purified and

reshaped in order to become a real theology of biblical revelation?

I am in sympathy with many Neo-Thomistic motives. Nevertheless, I do not believe that the modern (as well as the older) followers of Thomas have adequately solved the problem of revelation and reason, of theology and philosophy.

JOSEPH L. HROMADKA

Faith under Fire, by MICHAEL COLEMAN. New York, Scribner's, 1942. Pp. 160. \$1.50.

This book is one answer to the question, What are British ministers preaching about these days? The author is the Acting Vicar of All Hallows Church who has been busy during bombings and blackouts preaching and teaching the big themes of the Christian faith. There is a sort of parable here. All Hallows Church, in the shadow of the Tower of London, stands upon the ruins of an old Druid temple. That is to say, what is left of All Hallows, for it was bombed in December, 1940, and nothing but a single pillar remains. Yet the work of ministering and preaching goes on, in the basement shelter of the church and in a number of neighboring shelters and dugouts. Mr. Coleman has been particularly interested in religious discussion groups where all sorts of questions about God and the Christian faith are encouraged. "The faith I have," says the author, "is a faith that has been under fire; under fire from blitz, under fire of criticism." The chapters deal with such topics as, Does God really exist?, Is God good?, Sin, Is the Old Testament true and of value today?, Is Jesus Christ God?, the Church, Prayer, etc. Each chapter is introduced by giving it an actual setting, for example, "Tonight we are visiting Crutched Friars sub-fire station. . . . So far, there has been no raid, not even the warning wail of a siren, so we may hope for an uninterrupted hour of discussion." The author is convinced that heckling and even ribald questioning are good signs since "men don't bother to hammer away at anything they are not really interested in." And there is a hopeful note in the observation that "it may yet be that the loss of our Churches (through bombings) will bring our people to a truer knowledge and a greater love of the real Church—not made with hands—for the Church is a way of life and not a building." The captious critic might find points of weakness here and there in the book, but withal it is a tract for the times and deserves a wide reading.

HUGH THOMSON KERR, JR.

The Inner World, by JOHN WRIGHT BUCKHAM. New York, Harper's, 1942. pp. 285. \$3.50.

We have in this scholarly volume another illustration of the preoccupation in American theological circles with the philosophy of religion. Although the subtitle of the book is, "An Introduction to the Philosophy of Christianity," and although the author is Professor Emeritus of Christian Theology, Pacific School of Religion, the problems dealt with are mainly philosophical and metaphysical rather than religious or theological. The book is divided into four parts, the Members, the Structure, the Source, and the Expansion, of the Inner World. There are long discussions about the "self," "experience," "truth," "religion," etc. The footnotes and references are copious and extended. There are many typically verbose philosophical definitions, such as: "A person is a dynamically integrated self, striving toward an ethical-social Ideal, having ultimate value-reality and a conscious, or semiconscious, relation to the Supreme Person." As representative of what the author calls "Christian (or Christocentric) Personalism," he lists the following names: Bushnell, Ritschl, Coleridge, Rauschenbusch, Berdyaev, George A. Gordon, John Oman, William Temple, Flewelling, McConnell, Knudson, Von Hügel, John A. Mackay, Kagawa, John Baillie, H. V. White, Nels Ferré. One wonders what meaning can be attached to such a roll-call as this! In the midst of all this there are repeated references to the teachings of Jesus and the significance of religion for the interpretation of ultimate reality. A chapter on "Revelation," though excellent in itself and specifically related to the Incarnation, gives the impression, however, of being inserted as a kind of parenthesis into the main stream of thought. Coming late in the book (Chapter XII), the discussion of revelation makes it obvious that we are not dealing here with a philosophy of Christianity but with a philosophy of religion in general, of which the Christian revelation is only one consideration among many. Nevertheless, it may be that this book is a straw in the wind. As a philosophy of religion in general it deserves no more notice than many other similar treatments, but its significance lies rather in the fact that the author at least makes the attempt to write a "Christian" philosophy of religion, certainly a desideratum in our day. That he does not altogether succeed is due perhaps to his philosophical preference for generalities. Yet the work has value if only because it dares to suggest that there is such a thing as a Chris-

tian philosophy, and it is hoped that others reading it will want to pursue the matter further.

HUGH THOMSON KERR, JR.

Christian Realism, by JOHN C. BENNETT. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1941. pp. xii + 198. \$2.00.

In this book Dr. Bennett pursues a two-fold aim. To the empiricist who is skeptical of all theology he wants to show that Christian faith is based upon experience, not upon speculation; to the liberal theologian, who was his companion of yesterday he is anxious to prove that after all there is something to be said for Christian tradition. Events themselves, he holds, have spoken too forceful a language for the last nine or ten years. Vanished is the easy-going hope of a necessary progress in history, and of an order of society that would be a perfect implementation of Christ's ethics. Having been a militant pacifist himself for many years Professor Bennett is particularly desirous to explain why we can no longer believe in pacifism as a political method and a general Christian ideal.

In four chapters the author develops the basic tenets of his present creed. In the idea of God more emphasis is to be laid upon divine forgiveness, in the idea of man sin should not be overlooked. In social life we should realize that the change of institutions is worthless, unless it is the result of a change in the minds of the persons concerned. Finally history should be interpreted as a divine process of redemption, in which the historical Jesus Christ and the Church play a central role.

It is a gratifying sign to see some of the former leaders of theological liberalism in this country, such as Reinhold Niebuhr and John C. Bennett, moving toward a greater appreciation of the Bible and of the theology of the reformers. Professor Bennett sees rightly that any form of Christian theology that ignores the facts of experience is out of question in the present crisis. But in a number of instances he seems to consider the experience of the non-Christian as normative for Christian theology. This procedure explains some of the strange views held in this book. Human knowledge would never have advanced but through ventures in experience and interpretation made on the part of certain exceptional individuals, who blasted the trail for the average man. Modern science, for instance, has been so successful because it was not satisfied with compiling statistical data based upon past experience, but elaborated new hypotheses which had to be verified

by subsequent experiments and new types of experience. Similarly theological realism must start from the assumption that the writers of the Bible and the great theologians of the past were not content to pay themselves with words. There must have been genuine experiences connected with their inspiration. Thus our present task in theology is not to define the meaning of the Christian doctrine by terms of "un-experienced" experience but rather to discover the kind of extraordinary experience that is underlying our Christian heritage, and to integrate our pre-theological experience into our Christian experience.

OTTO A. PIPER

Ransoming the Time, by JACQUES MARITAIN. New York, Charles Scribner's, 1941. pp. 322. \$3.00.

We Have Been Friends Together, by RAÏSSA MARITAIN. New York, Longmans, Green, 1942. pp. 208. \$2.50.

God: His Existence and His Nature, by GARRIGOU-LAGRANGE. St. Louis, B. Herder. Vol. I, 1939. pp. 392. \$3.00. Vol. II, 1941. pp. 576. \$4.00.

Ransoming the Time is a collection of essays in which Professor Maritain sets forth some of the dominant ideas of his life. Written in a somewhat less academic style than many of this writer's works, it comes to grips with some of the vexing problems of our time: how are men equal; what are our political ideals; who is my neighbor; what is God's plan for the Jews; what do we mean by social progress. The two chapters on the philosophy of Bergson prove to be especially good; but however false the metaphysics of this teacher of Maritain's may have been, it did capture or express the vibrancy of life which modern scholasticism, like its model, seems unable to appreciate.

Madame Jacques Maritain has set down for us recollections of her life in Russia as a Jewess, and in France as the friend and wife of one of the world's leading philosophers. This is the story of a spiritual struggle and pilgrimage. So barren had this couple found the intellectual life of their day that they preferred suicide "before the years had accumulated their dust" to such poverty. But they discovered Henri Bergson, who knew how to feed their minds, and Léon Bloy, who spoke to their hearts. We do not share the solution at which the Maritains arrived, union with the Catholic Church and the ac-

ceptance of Thomas Aquinas. But we, too, have known what it means to live in the wasteland of our age. These yearnings are our yearnings. And we are glad that a wife who understands her husband and his thought so well could give us these glimpses into his inner life.

In Garrigou-Lagrange we have the theologian par excellence of the Thomist revival. Jacques Maritain feels that he stands at the very summit of modern Catholic thought. These two volumes concerning the nature and existence of God display great learning and thoroughness. Aquinas lives once again in these pages. But one wonders if the Christian must cling so tenaciously to his proofs. What is the meaning of divine revelation if not that man is blind without God? The modern Catholic by his constant emphasis on the powers of man's reason obscures the tragedy of the purely human lot. These men are the theologians of the Roman Church but they are so enamored of the glory of their own intellects that they forget to inquire about that which is immeasurably more important, what God has said and done. Man does not live on these husks of reason. Not even the Catholic does that, as his worship proves. Scholasticism will never learn that faith is faith and not knowledge, that at the heart of Christianity stand a stumbling block and an offense. To be sure, we Protestants find ourselves in hearty agreement with much of what the Thomist says about the nature of God and the universe which he has created. But we feel that the philosopher should go on to become a theologian and that is to say, to examine the Word of God. When, however, he stands in the mere vestibule of life, the knowledge which man has from the creation, he cuts himself off from the richness, beauty, and warmth of God's life. The Reformation broke forth with power just because it met the deadness of a world lost in sterile speculation.

FREDERICK RIKER HELLEGERS

The Praise of Folly, by DESIDERIUS ERASMUS. Translated by H. H. HUDSON. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1941. pp. 166. \$2.50.

We are grateful to Professor Hudson for this beautiful edition of Erasmus' witty work. The introductory essay, the analysis and notes prove most helpful.

What interests us as Protestants in this work is that here we can see through Catholic eyes the Europe which faced the young Martin Luther. No one would accuse Erasmus of being a

fanatic and yet in this mocking eulogy of 1511 we find one of the most biting denunciations of a way of life ever written. When Erasmus had set down his criticisms, he was satisfied. Luther, burning because of the same wrongs, was impelled to act.

Our religious interest appears also to have been the controlling concern of Erasmus: the aesthetic, artistic portions of this encomium serve as a cloak under which he hides his attacks on theologians, monks, priests, bishops, cardinals, popes. What he tells us is exactly what we want to know about this era.

FREDERICK RIKER HELLEGERS

The Christian Interpretation of Sex, by OTTO A. PIPER. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons. 211 pp. \$2.00.

A frank and scholarly presentation of a Christian philosophy of sex, based on the Bible, has long been needed, and is here provided by Professor Otto Piper. The confusion which is widespread in this field confronts the Church with an obligation to teach with simplicity. To deplore the contemporary trend is not to correct it, and to avoid it is to leave the field to the non-Christian who speaks frankly, if not wisely, about one of the deep and persistent mysteries of human life. Moreover, merely to defend our own standards may be to support a compound of Christian belief and social custom, until our righteousness is no better than that of the scribes.

Professor Piper approaches the meaning of sex from the Biblical standpoint. The Christian view is not to be found in a summary of the reports of the psychologist or the biologist, but in God's revelation in His Word. Only by increasing familiarity with the Biblical teaching shall we "find ourselves once more in the fresh and pure air of the truth."

From this perspective we gain a deeper understanding of the disturbances in modern life which the modern naturalistic thinkers are so ready to recognize and so unprepared to solve. "When Paul is enumerating the sins which will exclude us from the Kingdom of God, it is not by accident that he never omits the sexual sins, and almost always puts them in the first place. This fact does not show that he was 'specially hostile to the body.' Rather it shows the insight of a man nineteen hundred years before the discovery of psychoanalysis, an insight which probed more deeply than the latter into ramifications and abysses of human nature. Paul saw how any confusion in sex matters exercised a

devastating influence upon the whole life of an individual and on his relations with his fellows."

The author points out the Biblical teaching that men and women are made for each other according to the will of God, and the union of husband and wife is indissoluble. Central in the Christian interpretation is the saying: "They shall be one flesh." Procreation is not the purpose of sexual union, but the blessing of children is a further indication of the goodness of God. Here the writer's analysis of the Roman Catholic view of marriage is illuminating.

The section of the volume dealing with the Virtues of Sex Life under the titles of Love, Faithfulness, Accord with Nature, and Chastity is one of the most discerning passages in modern religious literature.

This reviewer questions the author's opinion of the extent to which the modern revolution in morals has resulted in pre-marital sex experience. Moreover, while the divine institution of marriage as the will of two persons to live together in God's sight can be distinguished from the ceremony in which it is solemnized, those who are capable of making the distinction do not regard their marriage as effected until they hear the words: "I declare that they are husband and wife."

The concluding chapters on the Gospel of Forgiveness and Life in Truth, are from the deep places of Christian revelation, and describe again in glowing words the manifold goodness of God. This is an honest, scholarly work which lifts a difficult subject into a calm, clear light.

HAROLD E. NICELY

Rochester, N.Y.

Goals and Desires of Man. A psychological survey of life, by PAUL SCHILDER. Columbia University Press, 1942. pp. xii + 305. \$3.75.

This posthumous work of the New York psychologist bears witness to the crisis in which modern psychology finds itself. By an intrinsic logic its philosophical assumptions, even when not known to the mind of the scholar, will lead to views and methods that are in conflict with every-day experience. It is true to say that not all representatives of psychoanalysis and behaviorism show the same amount of keen insight and willingness to overcome one's prejudices as Dr. Schilder does. Not one of the least attractions of the book consists in the way in which the author points to the inability of the leading

schools to explain in a satisfactory way clinical problems.

In an inductive manner the author moves from the discussion of case stories—most of them concerned with sexual troubles—to a general philosophy of life. Most important among his results are the following principles: In every experience there is the body, the world, and the self. A constructive effort towards the world is already present in the perception and creation of objects. Sex is a relatively independent and general quality of organisms. Experience is social in every form. Psychology and ethics cannot be separated. The basic principles of morals are the integrity of other persons and ourselves in regard to body and psyche, the balance between superiority and submission, and the fuller mastery or reality in work and achievement.

The present tendency in theology toward realism receives an unexpected ally in the psychologist. It is interesting, for instance, to notice how the psychologist concurs with the theologian in pointing to the incompleteness of individual existence as one of the reasons for ethical duties and responsibilities. The author's limitations are due to his unwillingness to take Christian experience into consideration. His basis is too narrow to enable him to reach the heights of Biblical insight. But the value of this book consists in its tendency rather than its actual achievements. It shows that the psychologist begins to realize that more important than introspective analysis are objective goals set before the patient, and encouragement that will enable him to step out of his artificial self-centeredness and to face the moral realities and duties of life. There will always be pathological cases, where the trained psychologist alone is capable of helping the patient. But for the overwhelming majority of cases the book confirms the experience of the Church that with a definite message of truth, an absolute challenge and sympathetic fellowship we have the clue to most of life's problems.

OTTO A. PIPER

Prayer, by GEORGE ARTHUR BUTTRICK. Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1942. Large 8vo., pp. 333. \$2.75.

Dr. Buttrick's latest book is being widely read and highly praised. To the preparation he devoted years of careful reading and hard thinking. The result is the most comprehensive work on the subject, at least in English.

The book falls into four parts, unequal in length. The first, "Jesus and Prayer," is brief

and suggestive rather than complete and interpretative. The second, "Prayer and the World," is fuller and perhaps abler. It concerns prayer as a problem, from the standpoint of philosophy.

Let us hope that this discussion will not lead to a flood of philosophical sermons about prayer as a problem. In his part of a recent book, *Reality in Preaching*, Professor Piper says, "As a whole our apologetic approach to the modern man has done more harm than good."

The third section of Dr. Buttrick's work, "Prayer and Personality," is still more comprehensive and illuminating. It is psychological. Amid the successive theories and vagaries the writer keeps his balance. The fourth part, "A Way of Prayer," is comparatively brief. This is perhaps the ablest section; at least it is the most helpful. Hence one wishes that in spots there were much where there is little.

Dr. Buttrick writes well. On almost every page there are quotable sentences. They must have been written and revised again and again. At times, however, he could be more simple. He might make fewer literary allusions that call attention to themselves. Dr. Buttrick is able to stand on his own feet.

The book contains little that is new to one who knows the successive fields. But the form of presentation is often admirable. There is surprisingly little that arouses dissent. Because of the purpose the discussion is mainly intellectual, whereas prayer is a matter of the heart. It is "the offering up of our desires."

The discussion does not move the reviewer to pray. But those who know Dr. Buttrick intimately say that by his devotional life he has long since earned the right to speak where most of us ought to keep silent. The young men who work with him as student assistants love and revere him as a man of prayer as well as learning. Could there be higher praise?

ANDREW W. BLACKWOOD

The Highway to God. Lyman Beecher Lectures, by RALPH W. SOCKMAN. Macmillan, 1942. pp. 228. \$2.00.

The purpose here is to give an orientation course for young ministers and a reorientation course for other brethren equally confused. The lecturer writes well. He quotes from many, varied sources, and often aptly. He starts with our Lord's appraisal of John the Baptist. But the discussion is chiefly in terms of today.

The first chapter, "A Voice in the Wilderness," is about the current confusion among ministers, because of "lost landmarks." The

second, "A Reed in the Wind," is about the difficulties of being a preacher today. The third, "A Prophet," concerns the meaning of the holy office now. These chapters, while preparatory, are good of their kind. In spots they would be clearer if the writer translated his figures into facts.

In chapter four, "More than a Prophet," the lecturer comes to grips with his subject. Here he presents his philosophy of the ministry today. The discussion of "life situation sermons" is fruitful. The section devoted to "the cure of souls" is also helpful. This chapter might have been expanded so as to displace some of the problems. Are we not already sufficiently problem-conscious?

In a footnote here (p. 124) Dr. Sockman states his conception of preaching. He says that he seldom discusses any specific subject. He

deals with broad principles and then throws the searchlight on selected problems. This may be the way to preach in New York City. Dr. Sockman's record there is worthy of honor. But is a non-teaching ministry likely to lead laymen to the discovery of those "lost landmarks"?

The fifth chapter, "The Least in the Kingdom," deals with present-day problems about the Kingdom, whatever that may mean. The sixth, "The Children of Wisdom vs. the Children of the Market Place," presents certain problems about ethics today. While these two chapters offer helpful suggestions, one finds it hard at times to keep on the highway. There is too much mist on the mountains. In short, three chapters are promising; one is worth reading several times; the last two are anticlimactic.

ANDREW W. BLACKWOOD

ALUMNI PUBLICATIONS 1941

During the year 1941 the Alumni of the Seminary issued a large number of publications. The following list of books and pamphlets, arranged in the order of the graduation of their authors, comprises all titles that have been noted by the staff of the Library. Periodical articles are included only when copies of them have been presented to the Alumni Alcove of the Library. The date of publication is 1941 unless other dates are given.

Class of 1888.

Murray, David A. *I Believe in God; Studies in Christian Fundamentals*. 167 pp.

Class of 1891.

Bishop, William S. *Christ and the Spirit*. Longmans. 200 pp.

Class of 1893.

Lowrie, Walter, translated the following books of Søren Kierkegaard: *For Self-Examination, and Judge for Yourself*, Oxford; *Training in Christianity, and Edifying Discourses*, Oxford; *Concluding Unscientific Postscript* (with David Swenson), Princeton University Press; and *Present Age and Two Minor Ethico-religious Treatises* (with Alexander Dru), Oxford, 1940.

Robinson, George L. *The Bearing of Archaeology on the Old Testament; the L. P. Stone Lectures*, Princeton Theological Seminary. American Tract Society. 207 pp.

Class of 1896.

Eddy, George Sherwood. *The Kingdom of God and the American Dream*. Harper. 331 pp.

McAdie, Robert C. *Soul-winning Song Services; How the Ministry of Music Should be Used as a Real Aid in the Preaching of the Gospel*. In *The Sunday School Times*, Sept. 20, 1941. pp. 749-750.

Mecklin, John M. *The Passing of the Saint; a Study of a Cultural Type*. University of Chicago Press. 206 pp.

Class of 1902.

Robbins, Howard C. *Ecumenical Trends in Hymnody*. Federal Council Committee on Worship. 79 pp.

Woods, Henry M. *Our Priceless Heritage; a Study of Christian Doctrine Prepared Especially for Christian Schools and Colleges*. 2nd ed. Evangelical Press. 213 pp.

Class of 1903.

Nevius, Warren N. *Religion as Experience and Truth*. Presbyterian Board of Christian Education. 438 pp.

Class of 1905.

- Macartney, Clarence E. *The Greatest Men of the Bible*. Abingdon-Cokesbury. 222 pp.
 ——— *Little Mac; the Life of George B. McClellan*. Dorrance, 1940. 363 pp.

Class of 1908.

- Blackwood, Andrew W. *Preaching from the Bible*. Abingdon-Cokesbury. 247 pp.

Class of 1914.

- Napp, James E. *Sermons on the Shorter Catechism and Others*. Text in Marathi.

Class of 1915.

- Kagawa, Toyohiko. *Behold the Man*. Harper. 346 pp.
 Mackay, John A. *The Rôle of the Church as a World Force*. In *Religion and the Modern World*, pp. 137-149, University of Pennsylvania Press.
 ——— Preface to Karl Barth's *This Christian Cause*. Macmillan (the American edition of Barth's Letter to Great Britain from Switzerland).
 ——— *Yet not Consumed*, Address Delivered on December 29 in the Second Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, on the Occasion of a Special Day of Prayer Called by the Presbytery of Philadelphia North. 12 pp.

Class of 1917.

- Best, Harry. *The Soviet Experiment*. N.Y., Richard R. Smith. 120 pp.

Class of 1918.

- Barnhouse, Donald G. *God's Methods for Holy Living*. Philadelphia. Revelation Publications, 1940. 93 pp.
 ——— *Life of the Son, Practical Lessons in Experimental Holiness*. Philadelphia, Revelation Publications, 1939.
 ——— *Teaching the Word of Truth*. Philadelphia, Revelation Book Service, 1940. 189 pp.
 Tester, George. *Hearts of Oak, Continuing Balsams and Marigolds, Being Muses and Meditations*. Victoria, B.C., Hollins Letter Service. 52 pp.

Class of 1919.

- Bowman, John W. *Introducing the Bible*. Westminster Press. 94 pp.

Class of 1921.

- Robinson, William C. *The Word of the Cross*. Zondervan. 168 pp.

Class of 1926.

- Leiphart, Elmer E. *Believe and Live; Messages for our Times*. Introduction by Prof.

Charles R. Erdman. Daleville, Va., South-eastern Press, 1940. 184 pp.

Class of 1927.

- Gwynne, J. Harold. *Easter Lilies; Eleven Sermons on the Resurrection Appearances of Jesus*. Eerdmans, 1940. 142 pp.
 McComb, John H. *God's Purpose in this Age*. Revell. 93 pp.

Class of 1928.

- Bizer, Ernst. *Studien zur Geschichte des Abendmahlsstreits im 16. Jahrhundert*. Bertelsmann, 1940. 362 pp.
 Boettner, Loraine. *The Christian Attitude Toward War*. Eerdmans, 1940. 119 pp.
 ——— *The Inspiration of the Scriptures*. 2nd ed. Eerdmans, 1940. 88 pp.

Class of 1929.

- Ingles, J. Wesley. *Fair Are the Meadows*. Augsburg Publishing House. 250 pp.

Class of 1930.

- Bear, James E. *A Literal vs. a Spiritual Interpretation of the Bible*. Richmond, Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 27 pp.
 Harris, William G. *Teleology in the Philosophy of Joseph Butler and Abraham Tucker*. Philadelphia. 50 pp.

Class of 1935.

- Emurian, Ernest K. *Dramatized Stories of Hymns and Hymn Writers*. W. A. Wilde. 304 pp.
 Kepner, Charles W. *The School Challenges the Church*. Extracted from *School and Society*, Sept. 21, 1940. pp. 215-219.
 Fenton, Horace L. *Seek; a Bible and Devotional Guide for Individual and Family Use*. Co-editors, Rev. Horace L. Fenton, Jr. (and) Rev. Oscar R. Lowry. Plainfield, N.J., Ridgefield Publishers.

Class of 1936.

- Hunsberger, Herbert H. *Studies in Isaiah*. Zondervan. 64 pp.
 Lowry, Oscar R. Co-editor of: *Seek; a Bible and Devotional Guide for Individual and Family Use*.

Class of 1938.

- Kase, Edmund H. *From the Vesper Hour*. 1940. 113 pp.

Class of 1939.

- Baker, David W. *A Catechism of the Christian Religion, the Reformed Faith*. Cranford, N.J., Allen Printing Co. 40 pp.

Christie, Alexander. *The Doctrine of Holy Scripture in Calvin and Brunner*. In *The Union Seminary Review*, Oct. 1940, Jan., July, 1941. pp. 19-32, 116-127, 325-351.

Class of 1942.

Jurji, Edward J. *The Islamic Theory of War*. In *The Moslem World*, Oct., 1940. pp. 332-342.

Hromádka, Joseph L. *The Modern Trends in European Protestant Theology*. In *Religion and the Modern World*. pp. 21-25, University of Pennsylvania Press.

Jones, David H. Contributor to: Lotz, Philip H. *Altar Hour; Fifty-two Worship Services and Interpretative Meditations*. St. Louis, Christian Board of Publication. 287 pp.

Piper, Otto. *The Impact of Totalitarianism on Christianity*. Address Delivered before the Fall General Conference of the Schwenkfelder Church, Lansdale, Pa., October, 1941. In *The Schwenkfeldian*, Jan.-April, 1942.

——— *Christian Interpretation of Sex*. Scribner. 249 pp.

Zwemer, Samuel M. *The Art of Listening to God*. Zondervan. 217 pp.

——— *Cross above the Crescent*. Zondervan. 292 pp.

WILLIAM P. STEVENSON

The Board of Trustees of Princeton Theological Seminary has suffered a great loss in the death of its devoted and well beloved member, William Paxton Stevenson, LL.D., who died in Elizabeth, New Jersey, after a week's illness on December 30, 1941, in the eighty-eighth year of his age.

He was born in Baltimore, Maryland, February 24, 1854, and graduated from Princeton University in the class of 1876, of which his brother the Rev. A. Russell Stevenson, D.D., was also a member.

He was Assistant Treasurer of Princeton University (then the College of New Jersey) 1876-1877. After a year in the employ of the Pennsylvania Railroad he went to New York as the private secretary and for many years the partner of Robert Lenox Belknap and continued in business in New York till about 1925.

He married in 1881 Miss Marianne Witherspoon Woods of Lewistown, Pennsylvania, and they moved to Roselle, New Jersey, where he lived for the rest of his life. Mrs. Stevenson died in 1925.

He was an Elder in the First Presbyterian Church of Roselle for 47 years; was treasurer of Synodical Home Missions of

New Jersey (now National Missions) from 1901 to 1931; was a member of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., since 1897; a member of the Board of Managers of the American Bible Society since 1911; and an active and useful member of this Board since 1908, serving for many years as a member of the Finance and Investment Committee and participating wholeheartedly in the planning which resulted in the reorganization and unifying of the Boards of Directors and Trustees into the present Board of Trustees to the great benefit of the Seminary.

In 1930 the degree of LL.D. was bestowed upon him by the College of the Ozarks, a richly deserved honor in recognition of his devoted services to the Presbyterian Church.

Truly the path of the righteous is as the dawning light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day.

To his daughter Miss Margaretta P. Stevenson and his son Walker W. Stevenson the Board expresses its deep sympathy and its gratitude for the richness of that spiritual heritage which we also share.

J. WILLISON SMITH

It is both a privilege and a duty to place in the records of this Board this official recognition of the great service rendered our Church and this Seminary by Mr. J. Willison Smith, a member of this body and of its Finance Committee from the year 1929 until his death on March 10th.

Mr. Smith was one of those chosen by the General Assembly to inaugurate the new era in the life of this institution, initiated by the adoption in 1929 of the revised "Plan" for its government. He had the highest qualifications for this important service. He was a successful business man of eminence in his native city of Philadelphia. There he had won the confidence of the leaders of both private and public enterprises of first magnitude, not through family prestige or other advantageous circumstances but by his sterling character and notable achievements. More important still, he was a devoted servant of the Church. While in his teens, he became President of the Philadelphia Christian Endeavor Society organization, then a very vital and active group. He had barely reached his majority when he was elected a ruling elder, an office which he held continuously for more than forty years. Practically all of this time he served also as a progressive and effective Sunday School superintendent. He also was vitally concerned with the work of the Presbytery of Philadelphia and of the Synod of Pennsylvania.

In 1921 he was elected by the General Assembly to membership on the Executive Commission. Before his term expired, this body became the General Council, and Mr. Smith was one of the few who were continued in membership on this highly important body. As one of its members, he served for two terms of six years each, with the necessary interval of one year between. He rendered signal service as Chair-

man of its Budget and Finance Committee, and had much to do with the formulation of wise methods for raising and distributing among the Boards of the Church money sought for their work from living givers. As President of the trust company which for many years has been the Treasurer of the General Assembly, he was for nearly a generation the chief financial adviser of the General Assembly in the collection and distribution of its income for current expenses.

For twenty-five years he was related, as officer, member, or adviser, to the Board of Ministerial Relief and Sustentation and to its successor, the Board of Pensions, and was a leader in the raising of the Fifteen Million Dollar Fund which made possible the Service Pension Fund. He was also at the time of his death, Chairman of the General Assembly's Committee on Emergency Disasters.

Although he served with distinction as Grand Master of the Grand Masonic Lodge of the jurisdiction of Pennsylvania, and was a member of the Philadelphia Board of City Trusts, with its vast holdings which include the great Girard Estate, he valued most the recognition of services rendered his fellow men, recognized by the degree of LL.D. conferred upon him by one of our major colleges, and the further recognition of his devotion to our Church which was given him when he was seriously considered for Moderator of our General Assembly in 1927.

Mr. Smith was uncompromising in his loyalty to his Master. No business or other success changed the simplicity of his home life or his loyalty to his Sunday obligations. He was always, first of all and most of all, eager to serve the Presbyterian Church and its agencies. No one of us who sought his cooperation in ecclesiastical matters ever failed to find him immedi-

ately accessible and whole-heartedly and wisely cooperative. We here record our gratitude to God for His gift of Mr. Smith to our Church and to our country.

It is directed that this minute be spread

upon the records of this meeting, and that a copy be sent, with the deep sympathy of the Board, to Mrs. Smith and through her to their daughter and sons and their families.



FACULTY

JOHN ALEXANDER MACKAY, Litt.D., D.D., LL.D., L.H.D.

PRESIDENT AND PROFESSOR OF ECUMENICS

HENRY SEYMOUR BROWN, D.D.

VICE-PRESIDENT AND LECTURER IN PASTORAL THEOLOGY

GEERHARDUS VOS, Ph.D., D.D.

PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL THEOLOGY, EMERITUS

CHARLES ROSENBURY ERDMAN, D.D., LL.D.

PROFESSOR OF PRACTICAL THEOLOGY, EMERITUS

SAMUEL M. ZWEMER, D.D., LL.D.

PROFESSOR OF THE HISTORY OF RELIGION AND CHRISTIAN MISSIONS, EMERITUS

WILLIAM PARK ARMSTRONG, D.D.

GRADUATE PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT EXEGESIS

FREDERICK WILLIAM LOETSCHER, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D.

ARCHIBALD ALEXANDER PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY

ANDREW WATTERSON BLACKWOOD, D.D.

PROFESSOR OF HOMILETICS

JOHN E. KUIZENGA, D.D.

CHARLES HODGE PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

HENRY SNYDER GEHMAN, Ph.D., S.T.D.

WILLIAM HENRY GREEN PROFESSOR OF OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE

ELMER GEORGE HOMRIGHAUSEN, Th.D., D.D.

THOMAS W. SYNNOITT PROFESSOR OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

DONALD WHEELER, Litt.D.

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC SPEAKING

OTTO A. PIPER, D.D.

HELEN H. P. MANSON PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT

LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS

JOSEPH L. HROMADKA, Ph.D.

GUEST PROFESSOR IN THE STUART CHAIR OF APOLOGETICS AND CHRISTIAN ETHICS

EDWARD HOWELL ROBERTS, D.D.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF HOMILETICS

HUGH THOMSON KERR, JR., Ph.D.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

KENNETH SPERBER GAPP, Ph.D.

LIBRARIAN

J. CHRISTY WILSON, D.D.

SUPERVISOR OF FIELD WORK AND LECTURER IN ECUMENICS

LEWIS SEYMOUR MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.

VISITING LECTURER IN ECCLESIASTICAL THEOLOGY

JOHN SUTHERLAND BONNELL, D.D.

VISITING LECTURER IN PASTORAL THEOLOGY

CHARLES THEODORE FRITSCH, Ph.D.

INSTRUCTOR IN OLD TESTAMENT

EDWARD J. JURJI, Ph.D.

INSTRUCTOR IN ISLAMICS AND COMPARATIVE RELIGION

BRUCE MANNING METZGER, Ph.D.

INSTRUCTOR IN NEW TESTAMENT

FREDERICK RIKER HELLEGERS, Th.D.

INSTRUCTOR IN SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

LEFFERTS AUGUSTINE LOETSCHER, D.D.

INSTRUCTOR IN CHURCH HISTORY

JOHN FINLEY WILLIAMSON, Mus.D., LL.D.

DIRECTOR OF MUSIC

DAVID HUGH JONES, Mus.D.

LECTURER IN CHURCH MUSIC

DONALD MCKAY DAVIES

TEACHING FELLOW IN OLD TESTAMENT

ELWYN EARLE TILDEN, JR.

TEACHING FELLOW IN NEW TESTAMENT

GEORGES AUGUSTIN BARROIS, S.T.D.

TEACHING FELLOW IN BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS

JOHN ALEXANDER MACKAY, Litt.D., D.D., LL.D., L.H.D.

PRESIDENT

HENRY SEYMOUR BROWN, D.D.

VICE-PRESIDENT

PAUL MARTIN, A.M.

REGISTRAR AND SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY, EMERITUS

WILLIAM BOYD SHEDDAN, Ph.B.

LIBRARIAN, EMERITUS

EDWARD HOWELL ROBERTS, D.D.

DEAN OF STUDENTS AND SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY

KENNETH SPERBER GAPP, Ph.D.

LIBRARIAN

GEORGE W. LOOS, JR.

ASSISTANT TREASURER AND SUPERINTENDENT OF GROUNDS AND BUILDINGS

EDNA HATFIELD

ASSISTANT TO THE DEAN OF STUDENTS

